

SLOVAKIA



Published By
THE SLOVAK LEAGUE
OF AMERICA

SLOVAKIA

VOLUME XXXIII

1987-1988

NUMBERS 60-61

A scholarly annual devoted to the history, literature,
and culture of the Slovaks the world over.

Editor

M. MARK STOLARIK

Editorial Board

GEORGE J. DEMKO
U.S. Department of State

MICHAEL NOVAK
American Enterprise Institute

DAVID P. DANIEL
Concordia Theological Seminary

PETER PETRO
University of British Columbia

LOUISE B. HAMMER
Indiana University

NORMA L. RUDINSKY
Oregon State University

Slovak League Advisory Board

DANIEL F. TANZONE
EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK
JOHN A. HOLY

DRAGA DIVINSKA
JOSEPH C. KRAJSA

Publisher

The Slovak League of America
870 Rifle Camp Road
West Paterson, NJ 07424

Inquiries regarding the subscriptions should be sent to the above
address. The cost of a single issue is U.S. \$6.00

Manuscripts for possible publication and books for review should be sent to M.
Mark Stolarik, Editor, *Slovakia*, 700 Penfield Avenue, Havertown, PA 19083.

SLOVAKIA

Printed By
JEDNOTA PRESS
A Division of Jednota Communications, Inc.
Middletown, Pennsylvania
U.S.A.

1989

Table of Contents

ARTICLES

Jánošík: Unraveling the Man from the Legend <i>Patricia A. Krafcik</i>	7
Federalist Thought in Czechoslovakia During the Interwar Years <i>Josef Kalvoda</i>	23
Slovak Immigration to the United States and Its Relation to the American Socialist and Labor Movements <i>M. Mark Stolarik</i>	47
The Slovak National Catholic Church, Passaic, New Jersey, and the Jeczusko Affair <i>Raymond J. Kupke</i>	63

REVIEWS

Vojtech Kopčan, <i>Turecké nebezpečenstvo a Slovensko</i> <i>R. Vladimír Baumgarten</i>	89
Ján Tibenský, ed., <i>Matej Bel: doba-život-dielo</i> , and Juraj Chovan, <i>Pamätnica z osláv dvojstého výročia Jána Hollého</i> <i>Gerald J. Sabo</i>	91
Michal Eliáš, <i>Hugolín Gavlovič</i> <i>Gerald J. Sabo</i>	94
Pavel Hapák, <i>Dejiny Slovenska, IV</i> <i>Michael J. Kopanic, Jr.</i>	95
Stephan Parak, <i>Die Schweiz und der Slowakische Staat</i> <i>Stanislav J. Kirschbaum</i>	98
Carol Skalník Leff, <i>National Conflict in Czechoslovakia</i> <i>James Felak</i>	101

Pavol Petruf, <i>USA a studená vojna</i> Stanislav J. Kirschbaum	103
June G. Alexander, <i>The Immigrant Church and Community</i> M. Mark Stolarik	105
Ján Kačala <i>et. al.</i> , <i>Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka</i> John M. Kochik	108
Ludvík Patera, <i>Alexander Matuška</i> Louise B. Hammer	109
Il'ja Čičvák, <i>Vyvolávanie slnka</i> Yvonne Grabowski	111
Books and Articles Received	113
Contributors	117
Guidelines for Manuscripts	118

ARTICLES

Jánošík: Unraveling the Man from the Legend

PATRICIA A. KRAFCIK

The year 1988 marks the three-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Juraj Jánošík, traditionally considered by Slovaks to be their national hero. Preparations for the anniversary celebrations included the publishing of a study entitled *Neznámy Jánošík* (1986) by Jozef Kočiš, which expands on previous knowledge about the historical Jánošík and complements scholarly works such as Andrej Melicherčík's comprehensive monograph *Jánošíkovská tradícia na Slovensku* (1952) and the superb folklore studies and collections of Viera Gašparíková.¹ A major work on Jánošík by Gašparíková, *Jánošík: Obraz zbojníka v ľudovej kultúre* (1988), and a double issue of the journal *Slovenský národopis* (3-4, 1988), devoted exclusively to the brigand theme, are also new publications contributing to the celebration. Among the numerous festivities during the course of 1988 has been unveiling of a seven-meter high sculpture of Jánošík by national artist Ján Kulich in Terchová,² and an exhibit of folk art portraying Jánošík, sponsored by the Slovak National Gallery. Appropriately, the exhibit was installed during the summer months in Liptovský (Svätý) Mikuláš — the city in central Slovakia that witnessed Jánošík's trial and execution in mid-March of 1713. As one Slovak ethnographer has put it: "This year all of Slovakia lives with the anniversary of its beloved Jánošík."³

The question why Jánošík, who was one of a number of eighteenth-century Slovak peasants tried and executed as brigands and murderers, emerged as the national hero has long daunted Jánošík scholars. Likewise, the historical figure himself has continually escaped scholars and remains today but a shadowy profile sketched in by their research and educated suppositions. While Jánošík in folklore is a bold bandit, harassing members of the rich

and noble classes of society, and always thrilling his people with daring and dangerous exploits, the historical figure, as much as we can know him, appears very human. Clearly, he was a strong, adventurous young man caught up in some of the most tumultuous moments of his nation's life and, like everyone else, subject to the rule of the tough, often brutal authorities occupying Slovak territory at the time. We can best become acquainted with the Juraj Jánošík beloved of the Slovak people through Jánošík folklore and literary depictions, dramas, films, and folk art and portraiture, for it is through these that he and his exploits are most widely known. But how can we come to know the real Jánošík, the one whose birth we celebrate in 1988? For this we must turn to information drawn from a small file of historical documents concerning his life, both directly and indirectly.

Juraj Jánošík was a young man of twenty-five when he was brought from his cell in the sixteenth-century Vranov castle, just outside Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš, and placed before a county government tribunal in that city on March 17, 1713. He was exhausted from questioning by representatives of both the Liptov and Trenčín county governments, and suffered from wounds inflicted during his interrogation by torture which could have included any combination of the following customary practices: fire burns on the skin, penetration of red-hot pincers under the nails, crushing of the bones, stretching on the rack, and the ripping of tendons in the limbs.⁴ After enduring all of this, he stood to hear the following verdict and sentence:

Because the aforementioned accused, Juro Jánošík, having rejected both the commandments of God and the law of the state, two years ago turned to banditry and became a brigand captain; and with his comrades on the highways robbed many people of their belongings; and as it appears from his own confession, his comrades in his presence shot and killed in an ungodly fashion a priest from Domaníža; and since he also committed other such crimes; therefore, for such grave and evil deeds and transgressions of the law, he is to be thrust onto the hook through the left side and thus as an example to other criminals of this type, he is to be hanged.⁵

Jánošík's execution was most likely carried out the next day, perhaps in the city square or the market place near today's Janko Kráľ Museum which is located in an old mansion once owned by the Hanzély-Seligovy family.⁶ Jánošík's actual interrogation possibly took place in the back of that mansion which was purchased for such use by Liptov county officials in 1712 or 1713.⁷ It is thought that his body was removed to a cemetery about four kilometers from Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš in a settlement called Čemice which contained an unhallowed graveyard for insurrectionists (*kuruci*), many of whom had fallen in the uprising of Prince Ferenc Rákóczy II against the Austrian Habsburgs from 1703-11, in which Jánošík had briefly participated.⁸

While the execution put an end to Jánošík the man, his legend was born in folk tradition which was ripe for the glorification and idealization of a noble brigand who had come to represent revenge for wrongs perpetrated against the common folk under the harsh conditions of the time. The eighteenth century throughout Europe was, in fact, the "golden age" of brigandage, when those discontented with the ever more intolerable burdens of foreign occupation, serfdom, and forced conscription, fled to the hills and formed small outlaw bands for survival and for the harassment of the wealthy and powerful.⁹ These social bandits, considered criminals by the authorities, represented to their people free spirits and were perceived as champions of the poor and oppressed. Conditions in Slovakia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were likewise conducive to the emergence of social brigandage. Slovakia constituted the northern counties of the Hungarian Kingdom, and increasingly restless Slovak serfs served Hungarian overlords, who themselves in turn were held in voluntary or sometimes compulsory allegiance to the Habsburg Court. In these volatile times, Jánošík took his place among the social bandits, and within decades of his execution, a rich oral tradition had begun to crystallize around him.

Over the past two centuries, through the process of mythicization in folklore and literature, the legendary Jánošík has flourished. He and his mountain lads (*hórní chlapi*) are celebrated in numerous short folktales, lyric and lyrico-epic songs and ballads, and the plastic arts — ceramics, wood-carving, painting on glass.

The brigand dance, *odzemok*, with its exhilarating music and leaping over bonfires, is the most exciting of those performed by Slovak folk ensembles to this day — and reflects the scenarios brilliantly envisioned in artistic depictions of Jánošík and his men.¹⁰

The great Russian folklorist and researcher in Czech, Slovak, and Carpatho-Rusyn folklore, Pëtr Bogatyrëv, has stated that the more beloved a folk hero is, the more elaborately is his image embellished with the elements of fairytale magic and fantasy.¹¹ Jánošík demonstrates that this is indeed so, for his figure, especially in the folktales, shares numerous features with international fairytale heroes. He is invulnerable to harm and capture, with supernatural strength residing alternately in his magical belt, magical mountain axe (*valaška*), magical string, hair, or herbs — each acquired from witches or forest nymphs (*vily*). Like many other heroes, Jánošík is nursed by his mother until boyhood, and appears lazy until he obtains his magical objects. In the folktales, Jánošík engages in a series of exploits designed to expose and punish the arrogant lords, as well as common passers-by who speak against him, fear him, or lie to him. Like the English Robin Hood, he dons a series of disguises in order to penetrate lordly estates or to patrol the highways incognito, teaching proper morality to cruel noblemen and less than noble common folk alike.¹² Alongside folktales are folksongs and ballads which praise his dashing, masculine beauty, celebrate the free outlaw life, bemoan the struggles and death of the brigand at the gallows, and express his motivations for becoming a bandit.¹³

Each literary age has also depicted Jánošík according to its own needs and tastes.¹⁴ Late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century Slovak literature portrays a Jánošík derived most likely from market or bazaar song lore (*jarmočné piesne*) as a young brigand who tells his tragic story while languishing in prison.¹⁵ Nineteenth-century Romanticists, especially the Štúrovci, extolled Jánošík as a symbol of liberation, of Slovak nationalism, of Slovakia itself. Later Romanticism, partly under the influence of foreign models, gradually added love motifs, romance, and more adventure to his legend. In Socialist society, Jánošík has been portrayed as an early fighter for the rights of peasants and workers. During World War II Jánošík, as the “mountain eagle,” was again

evoked, this time by partisans who formed themselves into a "Jánošík brigade" in 1944. Other partisans in 1943 and 1944 circulated an underground anti-government journal entitled *Jánošík*.¹⁶ Through changing times and conditions, there has been no doubt about the power of Jánošík as a symbol of defiance and freedom.

Modern-day Slovakia, particularly in its theater, has dealt somewhat harshly with the noble image of Jánošík inherited from folklore and literary traditions. On the contemporary Slovak stage he has been depicted as an earthy, sensual young male, struggling not only with social justice, but also with his desire for a woman as in the Polish playwright Ernst Bryll's musical, "Maľovaný na skle" (premiered in October 1974), so popular in Slovakia. In Ľubomír Feldek's "Jánošík podľa Vivaldiho,"¹⁷ Jánošík is an attractive if somewhat vacuous young man who achieves fame as a noble brigand by accident when the real fame should have gone to his comrade Uhorčík. Finally, in Stanislav Štepka's "Jáánošíík,"¹⁸ he is a weak-willed outlaw whose comrade Uhorčík, a homosexual, outshines him and is the real and delightfully humorous leader of the little band, preoccupied with gathering good-quality loot from victims, especially foreign-made items.¹⁹

In émigré writings, as well as in films about Jánošík we see mainly traces of the folklore and the romanticized literary figure. If a "historical" figure is discussed, it is also usually derived from folklore and literary sources, rather than from actual historical documents. Almost any typical reference in émigré literature presents the following story: As a young man, Jánošík was studying for the priesthood when he returned home, having learned that his mother was ill. He found her dead, and discovered his father beaten by the overseer of the estate, one Šándor, for having missed work in the fields in order to minister to his dying wife. When his father then dies from the beating, a furious Jánošík somehow forces Šándor's own men to beat the overseer as a punishment and warning for the future. Now, as an outlaw, Jánošík flees to the hills, gathering about himself a band of mountain lads who harass cruel lords and rob the rich to give to the poor. He is finally betrayed to the authorities by a comrade, jealous of his love for the beautiful Anička, by being lured to a tavern rendez-

vous with her. Here he is apprehended by the authorities, not because he cannot fight his way free, but because an old Gypsy woman tosses dried peas to the floor and causes him to lose his balance and slip into the clutches of waiting soldiers. His folklore death — execution by hanging on the hook — while often elaborated by heroic motifs, coincides with his historical death.²⁰

Faced with these images of Jánošík, we turn finally to the historical prototype of Juraj Jánošík. There are three major sources from which we can reconstruct a life of Jánošík. First is the baptismal *matrika* or registry from the town of Varín, about 25 kilometers from Terchová. In this document, as in all baptismal *matriky*, the priest recorded the date of the baptism rather than the birth, as well as the names of the infant, the parents, and the godparents. Such registries are a rich source of information, but unfortunately, they are not always continuous. This situation has complicated the Jánošík history, and has made difficult the reconstruction of the Jánošík family tree.²¹

The second source of information about the historical Jánošík consists of documents surrounding his criminal trial on March 16-17, 1713, in Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš. These documents include a record of (a) Jánošík's interrogation by county authorities, (b) his brief questioning by two robbery victims from Žilina, and (c) his interrogation under torture.²² In the days before the actual trial, Jánošík was questioned on a number of points by representatives of Liptov and Trenčín counties. The minutes of this first interrogation contain questions presented to Jánošík, along with a third-person rendering of the answers he gave, and also indicate which questions he did not answer. Of the twenty-nine questions presented by the Liptov representative, Jánošík answered only sixteen, while he made some attempt at a response to all seventeen questions of the Trenčín representative. In answer to accusations of robbery by Žilina cloth merchant Ján Šipoš and Žilina jeweler Skalka, Jánošík admitted robbing both and described what he did with the loot. A brief list of Uhorčík's comrades is also appended to this interrogation. Minutes of Jánošík's questioning under torture show him responding to seven items. None of these minutes indicate how long the proceedings lasted. Among the trial documents is also a record of the trial itself which covers the ex-

change between the prosecutor, Alexander Čemický, and the defense lawyer assigned to Jánošík, Baltazár Palugyay, about which more will be said later.

The third source of documents essential to our acquaintance with the historical Jánošík are the records of (a) criminal trial proceedings against Jánošík's comrade Tomáš Uhorčík which also took place in Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš on April 19-20, only a month after Jánošík's execution (Uhorčík was executed on April 21), and (b) a written complaint lodged against Jánošík's older brother Ján in November, 1713, by the Strečno estate administrator for the Löwenburgs, Martin Florek. We have as well the subsequent criminal trial proceedings against Ján which took place on December 18-22 of the same year, when he was tried for brigandage by the landowners' court of Count Löwenburg at the Löwenburg residence in Teplička-on-the-Váh and later hanged.²³ Included in this third category may also be records which show that Terchová, Jánošík's hometown, and all of its residents, were challenged in August of 1712 by the Teplička court to answer charges of secretly aiding outlaws.²⁴

From the documents we know that Jánošík was born in one of the many small mountain settlements, called "U Janošov," located to the east of the city of Žilina near the village of Terchová in the mountainous area of north central Slovakia. The region is known for its thick patches of pine forest, craggy cliffs and caves, and rugged beauty. Jánošík's childhood familiarity with this terrain no doubt served him well in his later years as a brigand when he was forced to move quickly and easily through such country and to seek the natural shelter it offered. Since Terchová had no operating church or pastor at that time, but belonged to the Varín parish, Jánošík's baptism, as well as those of other children from Terchová and surrounding settlements, is recorded in the Varín baptismal registry. In his *Jánošíkovská tradícia*, the well-known Jánošík scholar Andrej Melicherčík refers to an entry in the registry indicating that Juraj Jánošík was baptized on January 25, 1688; was the son of Martin Jánošík and Anna Čišníková; and had two younger brothers Martin (baptized 1692) and Adam (baptized 1697).²⁵ In a later study, Melicherčík says that updated research indicated that Jánošík also had an older brother, Ján. But here

Melicherčík neither provides a baptismal date for Ján nor explains the absence of a date.²⁶

According to Rudolf Brtáň, who himself has analyzed the baptismal registry scrupulously, this Juraj Jánošík identified by Melicherčík and others is not the famous bandit.²⁷ In the registry, which had been interrupted for several years and then resumed in 1686 by Roman Catholic priest Michal Smutko, Melicherčík's Jánošík happens to be the first Juraj Jánošík listed as baptized.²⁸ But Brtáň says that between this first baptism on January 25, 1688, and September, 1694, there were in fact five Juraj Jánošíks listed in the registry, four of whom were baptized between these years and whose ages would have ranged from 19 to 25 at the time of the execution in 1713 — making them all potential candidates for the famous brigand.

After grouping parents and children into the four Jánošík family units, each of which contained a son Juraj (one Juraj was listed as the father of a son by the same name), Brtáň, contrary to Melicherčík, points to Juraj, son of Michal Jánošík and Barbara Cingel'ová, baptized on May 16, 1688, as the real brigand.²⁹ He derives his conclusion not only on the basis of the registry but also from crucial information in the documents of 1713 stating the charges brought against Juraj's brother Ján who is described as having, among other children, a daughter Dorota born in 1699.³⁰ The parents of Melicherčík's Jánošík, Martin and Anna Čišníková, according to Brtáň, had sons Martin and Adam, and also a son Ján, but he is listed in the registry as having been baptized in 1689, a year after their son Juraj. Thus he was not an older brother to Juraj, whereas the court documents clearly state that Ján was older. Furthermore, he would have been only 10 years old in 1699 — hardly old enough to be married and a father. The parents of yet another Juraj Jánošík (baptized in 1691), Juraj, Sr., and Anna Chorvátiková, also had a son Ján baptized in 1689. But this date makes him younger than Juraj as well and disqualifies him as the real Juraj's older brother Ján. How then does Brtáň convincingly support his contention that Michal and Barbara Cingel'ová are the parents of the real brigand Juraj?

Brtáň says that Michal and Barbara had a daughter Barbara, listed as having been baptized in April 1691, as well as Juraj bap-

tized May 16, 1688, and believes that they had still another son Ján who was older than Juraj, but whom we do not find in the registry simply because there was no registry between the years 1673 and 1686, precisely the years during which the older brother Ján was born and baptized.³¹ Brtáň thus explains what Melicherčík passed over in silence — why there is no baptismal date for Ján — and he thus rules out Melicherčík's couple Martin and Anna Číšniková as the brigand Juraj's parents. Brtáň traces the source of the mistake to an inaccurate initial identification of Jánošík's actual baptismal entry by a Varín priest from whom the information was first requested in the late 1920s.³² The priest located the first possible Juraj Jánošík listed in the registry, which had been resumed after a period by his distant predecessor Smutko, and most likely looked no further. According to Brtáň, this erroneously identified Juraj Jánošík has been handed down mechanically from scholar to scholar since then.³³

The young Jánošík, born sometime in late spring 1688, lived in his family's settlement with his parents, Michal and Barbara. Count Ján Jakub Löwenburg, lord of the Strečno domain to which Terchová belonged, is known to have sent some young boys of peasant origin to school in connection with the recatholicization of the area which he strongly supported and it would not have been impossible that Jánošík was given some education.³⁴ But this is doubtful, Brtáň says, since his home was five kilometers from Terchová, a hard road to travel in winter, and since his father might have hesitated to send his youngest son and helper away. The older son Ján was already married with one child and it is not known whether he was still living in his parents' home by 1699 when Jánošík was 11 years old.³⁵

In 1703 when Prince Ferenc Rákóczy II, one of a series of Hungarian nobles who over the years had attempted to limit or throw off Austrian Habsburg power, published his proclamation inciting insurrection against Vienna, Jánošík was 15 years old. Along with thousands of other Slovak serfs attracted by Rákóczy's repeated calls for liberation from Austrian overloads, freedom for serfs, and religious tolerance — and perhaps caught up as an enthusiastic youth desiring adventure — Jánošík joined Rákóczy's troops at the summons of one of his officers, Viliam Vinkler, in

December 1707.³⁶ He was later among approximately 400 insurrectionists or *kuruci* taken prisoner, and subsequently released, after a battle near Trenčín on August 3, 1708, which dealt a severe blow to the uprising. By 1711 the insurrection had worn down considerably, and shortly after the death of Austrian Emperor Joseph I, Hungarian leaders of the moderate wing of the insurrectionist movement finally made peace with the new emperor Charles VI at Szatmár.³⁷

Already after the Trenčín battle in 1708, however, Jánošík returned home and, as his trial records state, lived with his older brother Ján for a short time. Then, either on Löwenburg's insistence or on the initiative of Imperial Army officers who compelled former insurrectionist prisoners with promises and threats to enlist,³⁸ Jánošík joined the Austrian Imperial service and was stationed as a guard at the prison in the Bytča castle. During the heat of the uprising, many brigands, vagrants, deserters, and even students had joined Rákóczy's troops, and in turn toward the end of the uprising and afterwards, former *kuruci* were identified by county and state authorities as bandits and criminals — so that officially the line between insurrectionists and brigands was essentially obliterated. It was among a group of these imprisoned insurrectionists and bandits at the Bytča castle in prison in 1710 that Jánošík met and befriended Tomáš Uhorčík of Turzovka, a brigand captain, probably about five years his senior,³⁹ who had also served for a time in Rákóczy's army.⁴⁰

Court records state that Jánošík often showed special favors toward Uhorčík, perhaps easing up prison rules for him, bringing him better fare, or helping him maintain contact with his outlawed comrades.⁴¹ In the autumn of 1710, Jánošík helped Uhorčík to escape. Less than a month later, in November of 1710, with living conditions worsening at Bytča castle, illness spreading, and food in dangerously short supply, Jánošík's father, probably without much difficulty given these circumstances, paid a sum to the castle commander and had his son released from the Imperial Army.⁴² Jánošík went home to his parents in Terchová, but apparently met with Uhorčík several times during the winter of 1710-1711, and together with other members of Uhorčík's band, they robbed some merchants in Moravia in September, 1711, tak-

ing, among other items, a good deal of cloth.⁴³ This was both Uhorčík's last move as a bandit captain and Jánošík's first such action. On St. Michael's Day, September 29, 1711, Uhorčík swore Jánošík into the band according to custom.⁴⁴ Thus began Jánošík's brief career as a brigand.

Shortly after Jánošík joined the group, Uhorčík left the band, married in October, 1711, and taking the name Martin Mravec, settled in the village of Klenovec in the county of Malohont. Here he became a shepherd, eventually acquiring the reputation of a fine citizen. After this he participated in only one robbery with Jánošík and others, the attack on baron Pavol Révay of Turiec.⁴⁵ Uhorčík himself handed over leadership of the band to Jánošík, who inherited what was a loose-knit and apparently difficult group to control. Membership was fluid, and included Moravians, Poles, and Rusyns, but largely Slovaks, many of whom came from the mountainous Kysuca region of northeastern Slovakia.⁴⁶

Jánošík spent most of the winter of 1711-12 at Uhorčík's home, since brigands customarily dispersed for the winter, and he resumed his activity during the spring of 1712. He and his men robbed noblemen, merchants, a priest and a pastor's wife on the river Váh, and among others, a Žilina cloth merchant Ján Šipoš, a rich Žilina goldsmith and jeweler Skalka, a wealthy Imperial Army officer's wife, Schardonka, and her entourage on the road between Važec and Východná, as well as an Orava squire named Ladislav Zmeškal. They took everything from money, cloth, rich and fancy pieces of clothing, jewelry, weapons, wigs, and wine. When later questioned about the only murder — that of a priest from Domaniža — Jánošík denied involvement, stating that two comrades were responsible. In the end, the court was able to insist in the verdict only that Jánošík had been present when the murder took place.

When Uhorčík was interrogated a month later he confessed things which Jánošík himself had clearly withheld during his trial, information which also sheds light on their activity as bandits and on their character. For one thing, Uhorčík demonstrated that there was widespread support of Jánošík by naming several persons who helped him, such as the Terchová schoolmaster who gave him shelter and the Terchová innkeeper Rafaj who provided him with

food.⁴⁷ Jánošík's withholding of such information to protect comrades and supporters characterizes the records of his own interrogation. Secondly, Uhorčík spoke of "insurrectionist booty" which was stored at the home of a comrade, again something which Jánošík had never mentioned. He disclosed that Jánošík and his men had attacked smaller Imperial Army units in order to capture weapons. Most importantly, Uhorčík revealed that Jánošík told him that in Čičmany he had hidden cloth for the clothing of three hundred men, as well as money, and had hidden weapons by a stream near Terchová.

Jozef Kočiš raises the question whether Jánošík was perhaps involved in preparations for some potentially larger armed action connected with the only recently-liquidated uprising, the spirit of which could still be alive in him as a former *kuruc*. Likewise, Jánošík must have been suspected by the authorities of keeping contact with other insurrectionists. A former Rákóczy officer Viliam Vinkler, who had recruited Jánošík into Rákóczy's army some years earlier, was known to be operating secretly in north-western Slovakia, preparing a new uprising even after the Szatmár Peace of 1711.⁴⁸ And when Jánošík was asked by his Liptov interrogator if he had contact with exiles in Poland who were "traitors of the country and government of Hungary" (that is, Rákóczy insurrectionists, many of whom had fled north), he flatly refused to answer.⁴⁹ The piecing together of such information sheds new light on Jánošík's illegal activity, suggesting that he and others like him may indeed have had some very serious and far-reaching goals in mind to which they devoted their actions.⁵⁰

In October, 1712, both Jánošík and Uhorčík were apprehended in one of the many sweeps undertaken by officials to round up former insurrectionists and brigands, and were imprisoned for a few days in the castle at Hrachovo. Malohont county's deputy chief administrator, Pavol Láni, who was an acquaintance of Uhorčík and Jánošík, apparently was sympathetic with the Rákóczy uprising and helped facilitate their release. Trial documents later revealed that in repayment to Láni and his sheriff, Uhorčík and Jánošík gave them fox furs and several cheeses.⁵¹

The pursuit, prosecution, and execution of bandits, in hopes of squelching all public disorder surrounding and echoing the

Rákóczy uprising, received top priority among officials of several counties, including Trenčín, Turiec, Orava, Liptov, Hont, and Malohont, and also in Špiš and Šariš. Perhaps it was these general and ongoing investigations, along with information gleaned from the interrogations of other bandits, that led to the second and final apprehension of both Jánošík and Uhorčík in February or early March of 1713, most likely in the latter's village of Klenovec. Perhaps information concerning the whereabouts of Jánošík and Uhorčík provided voluntarily to authorities by the discontented outlaw Turiak-Huncaga may also have helped lead to their arrest.⁵² In shackles they were taken to Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš, imprisoned, and tried, and both executed a month apart.

The court records indicate that Jánošík's defense lawyer Palagyay tried to argue that his client had killed no one, had left Rákóczy's army on his own, had served in the Imperial Army, and had become a bandit as a vulnerable young man, and not by his own will, but under the strong influence of Uhorčík. He begged for mercy and for Jánošík's release. The prosecutor insisted that not only had Jánošík participated in Rákóczy's uprising, but that his thievery alone subjected him to the law of the land, the *Tripartitum*, and specifically Article 15 on brigands (supported by subsequent imperial decrees) which clearly said that bandits were to be hung, broken on the wheel, impaled on a stake, or decapitated as a warning to others. In the end, the prosecutor was victorious, and Jánošík was found guilty and executed.

Did Jánošík's Gypsy friends come to play while he danced under the gallows before throwing himself on the hook to die! Did he really smoke two pounds of tobacco in his infamous bandit pipe to astound and shame his people's oppressors while hanging on the hook? Probably not, but who can know with certainty? There may indeed have been a number of cruel estate overseers named Šándor, and although there is no mention in historical documents of a special Anička in his life, Jánošík admitted to having given stolen jewelry to certain young Terchová women. That Jánošík might have been betrayed by a comrade may well be close to historical truth. His slipping into the authorities' hands on dried peas scattered by an old woman in a tavern, however, rather than an actual event, may be a kind of mythical expression of ultimate

helplessness on the part of one people held in bondage by another.

Clearly, the Jánošík of legend and the Jánošík of history are different figures, although some traces of the latter peek through the former. The historical Jánošík is in some ways no less interesting to us now than the legend. True, the historical figure gave rise to the legend, but where the historical narrative is fragmentary, fails to explain actions, and fails to satisfy curiosity about a famous personality, human longing and creativity step in to flesh out the hero, to contour and recontour him as the need arises. And it is, after all, the legendary figure, dynamic, capable of change, and radiating an irresistible power, which has kept Jánošík alive and well through the centuries.

NOTES

- ¹ Viera Gašparíková, *Povesti o zbojníkoch zo slovenských a poľských Tatier*, Klenotnica slovenskej ľudovej kultúry, vol. 11 (Bratislava: VEDA, 1979). Besides this major collection of Jánošík tales, Gašparíková has a number of other publications on the subject of brigands.
- ² Ladislav Hrubý, "Tri storočia Jánošíka," *Slovensko*, no. 4 (apríl 1988), pp. 18-19.
- ³ From the letter of a personal friend.
- ⁴ Andrej Melicherčík, *Jánošíkovská tradícia na Slovensku* (Bratislava: SAV, 1952), p. 44.
- ⁵ Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík: Hrdina protifeudálneho odboja slovenského ľudu*, 2d ed. rev. and enl. (Martin: Osveta, 1963), p. 167. Translation of the verdict and sentence is mine. — P.K.
- ⁶ Rudolf Brtáň, "Slovenskí zbojníci v Sliezsku i na Morave," *Slezský sborník*, 64 (1966), p. 376.
- ⁷ *Ibid*; Melicherčík, *Jánošíkovská tradícia*, p. 55.
- ⁸ A. Rendek, "Kde je pochovaný Jánošík?," *Smer*, 27 January 1968, p. 5.
- ⁹ Eric Hobsbawn, *Bandits* (New York: Pantheon, 1981). The entire book is devoted to a study of the social bandit phenomenon.
- ¹⁰ See a number of Jánošík glass paintings in Irena Pišútová, *Painted Dreams: Slovak Folk Painting on Glass in the 20th Century* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1983).
- ¹¹ P.G. Bogatyrev, *Slovenské epické rasskazy i liro-epické pesni* ("zbojnickij cikl") (Moskva: AN SSSR, 1963), p. 25.
- ¹² See tales in the Gašparíková collection in footnote 1, as well as in the Bogatyrev study in footnote 11, Appendix 1, pp. 150-62.
- ¹³ See examples in Jiří Horák a Karel Plicka, *Zbojnícke piesne slovenského ľudu* (Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1965).

- ¹⁴ Bogatyřev, pp. 125-29; Melicherčik, *Jánošíkovská tradícia*, pp. 93-165; Peter Liba, "Jánošíkovské premeny, alebo: reflexie o jednej téme," *Slovenské pohľady*, No. 8 (1983), pp. 1-8.
- ¹⁵ Jan Vilikovský, "Tri nejstarší slovenské zbojnické písně," *Časopis pro výzkum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi*, XI, No. 5 (Bratislava, 1935), pp. 550-73.
- ¹⁶ "Jánošík — partizánska brigáda," and "Jánošík — ilegálny časopis," *Encyklopédia Slovenska*, Vol. II, 1978.
- ¹⁷ Ľubomír Feldek, "Jánošík podľa Vivaldiho," *Smutné komédie* (Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1982), pp. 79-118.
- ¹⁸ Stanislav Šteпка, *Jáánošíík: Správa o hrdinovi alebo hra na hrdinu* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1970).
- ¹⁹ The script ends when Jánošík goes off to join Uhorčík in brigandage. After this, Uhorčík takes center stage with a spontaneous address to the audience, broken by brief interactions with Jánošík and other characters. Presumably, the spontaneous address could include any number of topics, depending on the actor and audience response at the time.
- ²⁰ Among some émigré renderings of Jánošík's story are the following: Peter P. Yurchak, *The Slovaks* (Scranton: Obrana Press, 1946), pp. 75-87; Joseph A. Mikuš, *Pride in Slovak Origin*, 2d ed. enl. (Cleveland: First Catholic Slovak Union, 1973), p. 21; Mikuš, *Slovakia and the Slovaks* (Three Continents Press, 1977), p. 147; George J. Krajsa, "Jánošík," *Furdek* (1978). Krajsa's article on Jánošík appears to be only a slightly revised version of Yurchak's. It is interesting to note that the first novel ever about Jánošík was written by the Slovak-American newspaper editor and writer Gustáv Maršall-Petrovský in New York City in 1894 and published that year by *Slovák v Amerike* (for information see the issue of February 13, 1896, p. 6). I am grateful to Mark Stolarik for having provided the information concerning Gustáv Maršall-Petrovský. The first film about Jánošík was also produced by Slovak-Americans, the Siakel' brothers, in the early 1920s. Maršall-Petrovský collected many of the legends about Jánošík that later appeared in the famous 1936 film, directed by Martin Frič, which starred Paľo Bielik, tales which Peter Yurchak then incorporated into his book cited above. Bielik himself directed the 1962-63 color film *Jánošík*, containing and embellishing all the legends about the brigand.
- ²¹ Brtáň, "Neznámy, ale skutočný Juraj Jánošík z Terchovej alebo Kráľovej," *Predvoj*, 3 March 1966, pp. 8-9.
- ²² Melicherčik, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 61. According to an early Jánošík researcher, Ivan Houdek, the original record of Jánošík's interrogations mysteriously vanished in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, but what appears to be an authentic copy, called the "Fassio Janossikiana," most likely penned by the Slovak writer Janko Kráľ, remains. The documents of Jánošík's interrogations and trial proceedings appear in Melicherčik's *Jánošíkovská tradícia* (pp. 248-59), and they appear along with a copy of Uhorčík's trial proceedings in Melicherčik's *Juraj Jánošík* (pp. 165-76). All further direct references to documentary material in this article are taken from these studies.
- ²³ See Brtáň, "Neznámy, ale skutočný Jánošík," p. 9, where he refers to the document of complaint; and Jozef Kočiš, *Neznámy Jánošík* (Martin: Osveta, 1986), pp. 87-90, where he briefly summarizes Ján's interrogation.
- ²⁴ Melicherčik, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 62.
- ²⁵ Melicherčik, *Jánošíkovská tradícia*, p. 41.
- ²⁶ Melicherčik, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 60.

- ²⁷ Brtán, "Neznámy, ale skutočný Jánošík." His entire article is devoted to correcting this error.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*
- ³⁰ *Ibid.* In Strečno estate administrator Florek's allegations, Ján Jánošík is said to have had four children, baptized from 1699 to 1712. The birth registry lists no children born to this Ján after 1712, further lending support to the fact that he was the Ján executed in 1713.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ Even Kočiš in his *Neznámy Jánošík* identifies the wrong Juraj Jánošík (p. 87, and footnote 150). It is somewhat surprising that Kočiš' bibliography does not include any references to the handful of insightful research articles on Jánošík by Brtán.
- ³⁴ Brtán, "Neznámy, ale skutočný Jánošík," p. 9. Brtán suggests that the possibility that Jánošík had some schooling may have given rise to the tradition that he was a divinity student. Brtán also offers other possible factors for this legend.
- ³⁵ As in other Slavic cultures, it was customary for a young married man to live for a time with his family in his father's house. By at least 1708, however, if not earlier, Jánošík's older brother Ján must have been living with his wife and children in his own home. Court records clearly indicate that Jánošík stayed for a time that year with him, rather than with their parents, after leaving Rákóczy's army.
- ³⁶ Kočiš, p. 27.
- ³⁷ Robert A. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), p. 75.
- ³⁸ Brtán, "Slovenskí zbojníci," p. 377; Kočiš, p. 29. Both discuss this issue.
- ³⁹ Kočiš, p. 77.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
- ⁴¹ Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 67.
- ⁴² Kočiš, p. 47.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 48; Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 67.
- ⁴⁴ Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 67.
- ⁴⁵ See Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, pp. 72-74, for a summary of Jánošík's offenses.
- ⁴⁶ Lists of bandit group members have been compiled from court records. See Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, pp. 71-72; Kočiš, pp. 72-74; also Bogatyrev's commentary in *Slovenské epické rasskazy*, p. 5.
- ⁴⁷ See Kočiš, pp. 61-62 and pp. 75-76, for Uhorčík's testimony vis-à-vis Jánošík's.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 76.
- ⁴⁹ Melicherčík, *Juraj Jánošík*, p. 167 (see interrogation question #2).
- ⁵⁰ Kočiš, p. 76.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 52-54.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Federalist Thought in Czechoslovakia During the Interwar Years

JOSEF KALVODA

For centuries Central Europe has been an area of mixed nationalities and both Austria-Hungary and Czechoslovakia, when the latter was established in 1918-1919, were multi-national states. The need for peace and cooperation among the many national groups gave rise to several proposals for a federal solution of the problems of small nations living in the area. One may recall that on January 23, 1849 the Czech historian and political leader František Palacký proposed the reorganization of the Austrian Empire along federal lines.¹ One can also cite a statement by the known Czech journalist Karel Havlíček Borovský who argued against Bohemia's joining the German Reich proposed by the Frankfurt Parliament in 1849. He wrote: "Our federation is Austria."² The struggle for the state right by the National (Old) Czech party, led by František Ladislav Rieger, in the nineteenth century was also a reflection of the Czech nation's desire to federalize the Austrian state. Until World War I the struggle for the "state right" was continued by the Young Czech party, as well as by the other Czech political parties with the exception of the Social Democrats and Professor Thomas G. Masaryk who advocated federalization of the state along ethnic lines.³ In the interwar years several proposals for a federal solution of the Czech-Slovak problem and the problem of "Balkanized" East Central Europe and Europe in general were made by some citizens and political leaders in Czechoslovakia. These ideas will be briefly considered in this paper.

A discussion of federalist thought in Czechoslovakia ought

to begin with the first plans for establishment of a state that would include the Czech historical lands (Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia) and Slovakia, known originally as Upper Hungary. During World War I the idea of an independent Czecho-Slovak state was endorsed by some Czech groups both at home and abroad, including the Bohemian National Alliance and the Slovak League of America. In order to promote the independence movement, representatives of the two organizations met in Cleveland, Ohio, on October 15, 1915, where they agreed on what they believed their countrymen in Austria-Hungary would accept in the event of their liberation. The "Cleveland Agreement" provided for the autonomy of both the Czech lands and Slovakia, proclaiming that the union of the Czech and Slovak peoples will be in a "federative union of states," with complete national autonomy for Slovakia. Slovakia would have its own schools, its own state administration, cultural freedom and Slovak would be the official language.⁴

A few years later the agreement was presented to Thomas G. Masaryk in Pittsburgh at a meeting of representatives of the Bohemian National Alliance, the Slovak League, and the National Alliance of Bohemian Catholics. Since some Slovaks expressed an apprehension that in the future Czecho-Slovak state the Slovaks might be enveloped ("Czechified"), Masaryk, the president of the Czecho-Slovak National Council seated in Paris, decided to revise it. He wrote in Slovak the so-called Pittsburgh Agreement, signed by him and other Czechs and Slovaks on May 30, 1918.⁵

The agreement stated that representatives of the named organizations "approve of a political program aiming to unite the Czechs and Slovaks into an independent state comprising the Czech lands and Slovakia. Slovakia shall have its own administration, its own diet, and its own courts. The Slovak language shall be the official language in schools, in government offices, and in public life generally. The Czecho-Slovak state shall be a republic; its constitution shall be democratic."

The document was destined to have far-reaching consequences in the history of Czechoslovakia. In their struggle for self-government and their efforts to change the centralist constitution of 1920, the Slovak autonomists invoked the Pittsburgh Agreement. One may argue that the idea of a federal union of the Czechs

and Slovaks in the Cleveland Agreement, as well as the autonomous arrangement promised by the Pittsburgh Agreement, were manifestations of the influence of the United States federal system of government on the thinking of those who signed them. Similarly, as it is in the states of the American federation, the Pittsburgh Agreement stipulated that Slovakia "shall have its own administration, its own diet, and its own courts." Since Czechs and Slovaks are two different nations speaking similar but different languages, it was necessary to make the Slovak language in Slovakia "the official language in schools, in governmental offices, and in public life generally."

In view of the fact that in 1915, in a memorandum to the British government, Masaryk stated that the new state ("Independent Bohemia") would be a monarchy, because only a small group of "radicals" favored a republic,⁶ and that most of the leaders of the independence movement in the Czech lands and Milan R. Štefánik, who represented the Slovaks in the Czecho-Slovak National Council, were monarchists, it would seem that the American environment influenced Masaryk's decision to proclaim the new state a republic.

The principles stated in the Pittsburgh Agreement were not implemented in the Czechoslovak Constitution of 1920; the latter established a centralist state administration. Autonomy for Ruthenia, the easternmost province of Czechoslovakia, provided for in the constitution, was not realized either until the collapse of the First Republic in October 1938. (Incidentally, the Slovaks had autonomy during the Second Republic that came to its end in March, 1939.) Champions of the autonomist movement in Slovakia, the Slovak People's party and the Slovak National party, constantly emphasized the need for a federal arrangement in the state that they supported.

In May 1936, in a parliamentary discussion of the proposed Law for the Defense of the State (Law 131 of May 13, 1936), a Slovak People's party deputy and a former member of government, Jozef Tiso, declared that the Slovak nation considered the state of the Czechs and Slovaks their own state and that his party supported the law. As on many other occasions, Tiso discussed the Slovak problem and the demand for the implementation of the

Pittsburgh Agreement. As he put it, "Autonomy is education of the Slovak nation toward seeing in this state its own state in which it rules . . . Autonomy is education for state-forming thinking of the Slovaks" . . . "7 The autonomist program, he emphasized, made the Slovaks conscious of the fact that Czechoslovakia was their state, and that the latter did not mean the merging of the two nations, but a unity of the two nations in one common state.

In the discussion of the same legislative proposal a Senator of the Slovak People's party, Gejza Fritz, emphasized that the "root of the autonomy is the Pittsburgh Agreement, concluded and signed by Czechs and Slovaks and the then president of the Czecho-Slovak National Council," Masaryk. The autonomy was to be within the boundaries of the state, not outside of it. As he put it, "We demand self-government that is not incompatible with the state unity. That such an autonomy is possible is evidenced by the fact that the Constitution guarantees autonomy to Carpatho-Russia (Ruthenia) within the framework of the united Czechoslovak republic."⁹ He pointed out that the president of the state had signed the agreement and that for "those reasons it is not logical to claim that autonomy is separatism." In its substance, "autonomy means decentralization." In addition, the Slovaks demand equal rights for the Slovak language, he said, pointing out that "to strive for a united Czechoslovak nation would mean to increase the antagonism of all Slovaks."⁹

* * * * *

During World War I Masaryk's objective was the establishment of an independent state. However, until the summer of 1918 he was prepared to accept autonomy for the Czechs within the framework of Austria-Hungary if independence were not attainable.¹⁰ By this time France and the United States had already parted with the idea of preserving a federalized Austria-Hungary; the latter collapsed by the end of October 1918. But even after the declaration of Czecho-Slovak independence by Masaryk in Washington, D.C., on October 18, the Czech leader presided over a meeting of representatives of several national groups from Central Europe between October 23 and 26, 1918, that announced the intention to establish a Democratic Mid-European Union. This

meeting, held at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, led some people in Washington, D.C., to believe that on the ruins of Austria-Hungary a new central european federation would emerge. The final resolution produced by the conference, called the "Declaration of Common Aims of the Independent Mid-European Nations," was read by Masaryk in front of Independence Hall and was hailed by the American press as something approaching a declaration of a united Europe.¹¹

On November 1, 1918, the original of the declaration was submitted to President Woodrow Wilson by Masaryk, who was the first of its twelve signatories. In the accompanying letter to Wilson Masaryk stated that the union "tries to replace the German Plan of Mittel-Europe by a positive plan of reorganization of the many smaller nations which are located between the Germans (in Germany and Austria) and Russians; there are about eighteen such nations, beginning with the Finns and ending with the Greeks. . . . The primary aim of the war and the coming peace is the reorganization of the East, including now Russia; and the first condition of this reorganization of Eastern Europe and through it of Europe and mankind, is the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, composed of eight non-German nations, oppressed and exploited by a degenerate dynasty and reckless feudal aristocracy supported by the Germans and Magyars."¹²

In the last paragraph of the letter Masaryk proclaimed: "Mr. President, we see in you one of the greatest leaders of modern democracy and constructive policy; it is in making a sincere attempt to apply such a policy to our particular nations and to the whole of Europe that we hope you will engage your interest in our Union's endeavors."

The signatories of the declaration, claiming to represent "more than fifty million people constituting a chain of nations lying between the Baltic, the Adriatic and the Black Seas, comprising Czecho-Slovaks, Poles, Jugoslavs, Ukrainians, Uhro-Rusins, Lithuanians, Roumanians and Italian Irredentists, Unredeemed Greeks, Albanians, Zionists and Armenians, wholly or partly subject to alien domination . . . accept and subscribe to the following as basic principles for all free peoples."

“First. That all governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed.

Second. That it is the inalienable right of every people to organize their own government on such principles and in such form as they believe will best promote their welfare, safety and happiness.

Third. That the free and natural development of the ideals of any state should be allowed to pursue their normal and unhindered course unless such course harms or threatens the common interest of all.

Fourth. That there should be no secret diplomacy, and all proposed treaties and agreements between nations should be made public — prior to their adoption and ratification.

Fifth. That we believe our peoples, having kindred ideals and purposes, should coordinate their efforts to insure the liberties of their individual nations for the furtherance of their own common welfare, provided such a union contributes to the peace and welfare of the world.

Sixth. That there should be formed a league of the nations of the world in a common and binding agreement for genuine and practical cooperation to secure justice and therefore peace among nations.”

The signatories of the declaration pledged “on behalf of their respective nations” that the principles set forth in it “shall be incorporated in the organic laws of whatever government our respective peoples may hereafter establish.” As it happened, the vast majority of the Czechoslovak Revolutionary (Constituent) National Assembly, established after the war, followed Masaryk’s views and paid no attention to the principles stated in the Declaration of the Common Aims of the Independent Mid-European Nations. The assembly did not derive its powers from the consent of the governed; it was not elected by the peoples living in Czechoslovakia; the Germans, Hungarians, Poles, and Ruthenians in Czechoslovakia were not represented in it at all; and the Germans, Hungarians, Slovaks, and Ruthenians living in the country were not allowed to “organize their own government on such principles and in such form as they believe will best promote their welfare, safety and happiness.”¹³

* * * * *

While visiting the United States in the fall of 1918, Roman Dmowski, the head to the Polish National Committee Abroad, seated in Paris, suggested to Masaryk the formation of a Federation consisting of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland. Masaryk refused the proposal, but favored "a certain kind of Economic Union, to be worked out; and a military defense against Germany, essentially non-aggressive." Not foreseeing the problem of frontier adjustment with Poland, Masaryk asked Dmowski "to write out text of agreement on these lines." The Polish leader, however, did not formulate such an agreement, since he, apparently, was not interested in anything short of Federation.¹⁴

The proposed Federation of the three Western Slavic nations, Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, could have provided an ample guarantee of peace in Central Europe, since the three nations could have faced together the prospective threats coming from either east or west, and could have jointly resolved the national minority problem. In the 1930s the idea of close cooperation with Poland was endorsed by the leader of the Czechoslovak National Democratic party, Karel Kramář, and the leader of the Slovak People's party, Andrej Hlinka. At that time, due to hostility between Czechoslovakia's foreign minister Edvard Beneš, and the Polish foreign minister Jozef Beck, such a policy was not practical and could not be implemented.¹⁵

* * * * *

At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 Czecho-Slovakia was represented by a delegation of which the principal spokesman was Edvard Beneš. In *Memoire* No. 3, one of the documents submitted by him to the conference, addressing itself to "The lot of the Germans in the Czecho-Slovak Republic," a promise was made that "the Germans of Bohemia [sic] would have the same rights as the Czecho-Slovaks themselves. The German tongue would be the second tongue of the land. . . . The regime adopted would be similar to that of Switzerland."¹⁶ In his note of May 20, 1919, Beneš elaborated on the latter point, announcing the intention of the state to apply the principles of the Swiss Republic in creating the organs of the new state that would be "a sort of Switzerland." In the con-

clusion of his memorandum Beneš promised "an extremely liberal regime, which will very much resemble that of Switzerland."¹⁷

This was a statement of intention — one of those by which the way to hell is paved. It was not implemented and a centralistic Constitution was adopted in Czechoslovakia in 1920. One may speculate, as did Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, that "had the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia at the time of its organization in 1919 been based upon the cantonal system, its history . . . might have been very different and far happier."¹⁸

* * * * *

Dr. Milan Hodža, a Slovak by birth, was a well-known exponent of the idea of establishing a Central European or a Danubian Federation.¹⁹ He proceeded from the assumption that the League of Nations and the Little Entente were ineffective and inadequate for preserving peace in Europe. The latter had to unite in order to maintain peace and advance prosperity. However, Europe's final unification presupposes, first of all, an effective regional cooperation. Therefore, Hodža developed the theme of the union of Central Europe when the new order was established in Europe after World War I. As a prominent politician of the Republican (agrarian) party, he propagated the idea of a federated Central Europe numbering about 110 million people, stretching from the Baltic to the Aegean Sea and covering the region between Germany and Soviet Russia.²⁰ Since the states in the region were predominantly agrarian, the federation had to be based on agrarian democracy.²¹

Already in 1925, at the national congress of the Republican party, Hodža declared that there was a need for Central European solidarity; the latter would save Czechoslovakia from either Bolshevik or imperialistic attack.²² He believed that the interests of Czechoslovakia and Poland could be reconciled and their close cooperation with the other nations in the area would benefit all of Europe. In his lecture, delivered in London in 1930, Hodža stated: "It is universally an international danger when dictatorship becomes a contagious disease, which weakens the organism of states and nations. Thus one day we could expose ourselves to the danger which might infect Central Europe with Moscow's

dictatorship. Therefore, it is important that Central Europe does not become the carrier of dictatorial bacilli, but rather a trench, or barrier, against dictatorship.”²³

In Hodža's view, the national sovereignty of small nations should not be construed as isolationism, but rather a foundation stone for international cooperation. Since the nations of Central Europe have mutual interests and similar traditions, they have to come closer together and work for a wider international cooperation. A federation of states from the Baltic to the Aegean Sea, united on the basis of democratic principles, would be a barrier against Bolshevism and the first step toward establishing a United States of Europe.²⁴

Hodža became prime minister of Czechoslovakia in November 1935 and Beneš was elected the state's president in the middle of December 1935. When from December 20, 1935, to February 29, 1936, Hodža was also the acting minister of foreign affairs, he tried very hard to get his favorite project off the ground. In an attempt to implement it, he visited Vienna on January 17, 1936, Paris, February 8-15, Belgrade, February 21-25, and again Vienna, March 8-10, 1936.²⁵ The Austrian Chancellor Kurt von Schuschnigg fully endorsed Hodža's project, but it was viewed skeptically in other countries and, above all, in the Czechoslovak ministry of foreign affairs staffed by Beneš appointees. The new president was especially annoyed by Hodža's conduct of foreign policy. Later Beneš commented with disdain on the prime minister's activities as follows: "Hodža went to Vienna, had lunch with Schuschnigg, told him that something should be done in Central Europe to remove the German threat to Austria. Upon his return to Prague he told me that he had negotiated an alliance with Austria. It caused alarm in France and in England, because these countries were informed to the effect that everything would be signed, sealed and delivered in three weeks. Of course it was a bluff.”²⁶

When in the summer of 1938 a large demonstration in favor of autonomy of Slovakia took place in the capital city of Bratislava, Hodža made an attempt to take the wind out of the autonomist sails. He revealed his own plan for self-government in Slovakia. This proposal, known as the "Hodža Plan," was revealed in detail

in his *Slovenský denník*. The key provision in it was as follows: "Slovakia will have her own diet with legislative powers, her own government of six ministers to deal exclusively with Slovak matters. The Slovak language will be the only official language in Slovakia. A separate Slovak commission will supervise and decide the personal questions connected with appointments of the state employees to eliminate irregularities and to see that Slovak claims are not bypassed."²⁷

After the Munich settlement, on October 6, 1938, Slovak autonomy was proclaimed. The manifest was signed by seven non-Socialist parties (including the Slovak People's party), representing about 75 percent of the Slovak electorate. The Czecho-Slovak National Assembly approved the Constitutional Law of Slovak self-rule on November 22, 1938 by a unanimous vote. (The deputies of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia left the Chamber before the voting.)²⁸

* * * * *

In the interwar years a prominent federalist advocating the establishment of a United States of Europe, Count Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, lived in Czechoslovakia. He became famous after World War II, when many Americans and West Europeans embraced his ideas.²⁹ His pioneering work did bring fruits when the West European community was established. Czechoslovakia, however, was a member of the Soviet bloc, and did not benefit from it.

Born in Tokyo on November 17, 1894, Coudenhove-Kalergi's mother was Japanese and his father was an Austrian diplomat. The Coudenhove-Kalergi's home was the old Castle of Ronsperk in Bohemia. The Treaty of Saint Germain of 1919 made the Count a citizen of Czechoslovakia.³⁰ When the Nazis occupied the country in 1939, he accepted French citizenship and, eventually, left Europe for the United States.

During the interwar years Coudenhove-Kalergi was the leading theoretician and founder of the Pan-European movement. He devoted his talents and efforts to the cause of European federation. Among those whom he inspired and persuaded to support the movement was Edouard Herriot, a one-time prime minister

and minister of foreign affairs in France, and the author of *The United States of Europe*. Herriot was the first European statesman who appealed openly for a United States of Europe.³¹

A student of history, Coudenhove-Kalergi was familiar with attempts to unify Europe made over the centuries by writers and kings, including George Podiebrad, a famous King of Bohemia in the fifteenth century. His first article on "The European Question" appeared in the summer of 1922 in the Berlin *Völkische Zeitung* and the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse*.³² After finding some influential supporters among political leaders of the time, the first issue of the movements's new periodical, *Pan-Europe*, came out in April 1924. It contained an article entitled "The European Manifesto." Due to extensive publicity generated by the movement, his book on *Pan-Europe* began to appear in several languages.³³ The English language edition, with an introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, was published in 1926 in New York.³⁴

In *Pan-Europe* Coudenhove-Kalergi noticed the political decline of Europe as a consequence of the World War: "From the center of the world Europe has moved to its periphery. The world hegemony of Europe is overthrown for all time." The validity of the last sentence was called to doubt by some, when Germany rose again as a great power in the 1930s. Yet the outcome of World War II confirmed his observation that "the United States of America has developed into the leading World Power." As he observed in his book first published in 1923, in the World War the United States "proved the decisive factor. Today, the United States of America is the wealthiest, the most powerful, and the most advanced country in the world." At the same time, however, "Europe's power of action in world politics is paralyzed by her disunion."³⁵

In advocating the consolidation of Europe into a politico-economic federation, Coudenhove-Kalergi encountered objection from several quarters branding Pan-Europe a utopia. To this he replied that "every great historical happening began as a utopia and ended as a reality." He pointed out that in 1913 the Polish and Czecho-Slovak republics were utopias; "in 1918 they became realities. In 1916 the victory of the communists in Russia was a

utopia; in 1917 it was an accomplished fact.”³⁶ Whether Pan-Europe would be realized depended on the will of the Europeans; if the latter would support the idea and work for it, a utopia would become a reality. As he put it, “While thousands believe in Pan-Europe, it is a utopia; so long as millions believe in it, it is a program; but once a hundred million believe in it, it becomes a fact.” Thus in 1923 Coudenhove-Kalergi called upon the youth of Europe “to convert the utopia of yesterday into a reality of tomorrow.”³⁷

Constantly referring to historical events, Coudenhove-Kalergi emphasized that power-relationships among countries have been changing with time. For example, the Bohemian empire of King Ottokar was a great power stretching from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and was about the size of European Russia; Bohemia of the 1920s was as small as was the Grand Duchy of Weimar a century earlier. According to him, “Time works *for* Russia and *against* Europe.” This was an observation not shared by many people at that time. He also pointed out how the United States became a great power and how this technically most advanced country was “the first to try the new method of political organization, namely, a system of peaceful federations, culminating in the Pan-American Union and in the idea of a League of Nations. Although the American conditions are different than those in Europe, states that are small may not be able to lead an independent existence and, therefore, they have to establish federations.” As he saw it, “The leading World powers of today are federations: Russia, England, America. Political rapprochement of neighboring countries must be realized, if conflicts are to be avoided.”³⁸

Coudenhove-Kalergi observed that the formation of the Pan-American League was not directed against any other state system, but solely against war, and “toward furthering the cultural progress of all.” The American example should be followed by Europe. The latter must supplement “its modern science of communications by a modern science of politics, else it will be in danger of blindly staggering into another war and of suffocating in a very sea of gas-bombs.”³⁹

The Count regretted that Europe was regressing further and further toward atomization, since Austria-Hungary, Western

Russia, and European Turkey dissolved themselves into a multitude of petty states. This process needs to be reversed by promoting integration, otherwise, if the liberation of European peoples is not completed by their unification, "sooner or later the European state will be swallowed up by the growing World Powers."⁴⁰ Europe must find a means of harmonizing freedom with organization, that is to follow the example of America in establishing a federation.

Coudenhove-Kalergi presented a plan for the establishment of such a federation and discussed several reasons for which the nations of Europe should unite. First, Bolshevism made no secret of her aggressive intentions: Bolshevism fights with propaganda in the one hand and with sword in the other; "it resorts to violence, terrorism and militarism."⁴¹ Therefore, the aim of all Europeans, regardless of party or nation, should be the prevention of a Soviet invasion that would bring about the destruction of liberty and the other cherished values. A Pan-European security pact guaranteeing the protection of European eastern frontiers would lay the foundation for an understanding with Soviet Russia. He suggested that if Texas, New Mexico, and California were independent states, they would be in constant danger from Mexico. But "as states of the American federal union they are secure against any such danger."⁴² Similarly, the Soviet threat to Romania, Poland, and Finland would disappear as soon as they would become members of the United States of Europe. As long as they were isolated, they represented a constant temptation for Soviet Russia.

Furthermore, Coudenhove-Kalergi suggested that the quarrels among the European states weakened their power defense against Soviet Russia. Therefore, there was a need for European solidarity for an effective defense of the eastern frontiers of Europe. Any war in Europe would offer the Soviets a welcome opportunity for intervention; "and once Russian armies have secured a footing in Europe, they will scarcely relinquish it of their own free will." He also saw a danger in the pro-Russian orientation of some states, notably Germany. He suggested that there was a large number of Germans who hoped, "through an alliance with Russia, to tear up the Treaty of Versailles and once more partition Poland."⁴³

Whether Germany would be saved or estranged from Europe depended on the Western powers, above all on France, Coudenhove-Kalergi wrote, and he predicted that in the Franco-German conflict neither Germany nor France, "but Russia will in the long run be victorious." He warned that France still had time to preserve "the German sister republic for the family of European states; tomorrow it may be already too late." He added that "upon this question hinges the future of Europe."⁴⁴

Though less immediate, there was a danger "from forcible separation of eastern Europe," should there be a sudden change in the internal policy of Russia, and should the latter return to Pan-Slavism. In that case the Pan-Slav memories of the Southern and Western Slavs would be revived and Hungary and Bulgaria would try to recover lost territories "by means of an alliance with the Russian reaction. In that event Russia's power would extend as far as the Adriatic Sea."⁴⁵

These dangers, Coudenhove-Kalergi believed, could be averted by the timely creation of the Pan-European Federation. In his view, the historical moment in the time of his writing (1923) was more favorable than it ever was before. The situation would likely worsen every month and "it is more than doubtful whether after a victory of the Russian reaction a Pan-European Federation would still be possible,"⁴⁶ he wrote.

The formation of the United States of Europe would make possible an agreement on disarmament and economic cooperation with Soviet Russia. Since united Europe would possess great military and economic power, the danger of war with Russia would be removed. As long as Europe was divided, he said, there was a danger of a new war. A united Europe would have a larger population and incomparably more highly developed industries and, therefore, Soviet Russia "would realize the hopelessness of war and will be ready to disarm." But, he writes, as long as the regime in Russia is organized on a Soviet basis, it would be better for "Russo-European peace if these two federations remain separate."⁴⁷ The Soviet regime endeavored to overthrow the democratic order in Europe and, therefore, a merging of the two federations was not practical. However, "Should Russia become democratic, a new situation would result." Then it would be possi-

ble to consider the question of Russia's joining the European federation.

Turning to Europe's relations with the United States, Coudenhove-Kalergi wrote that "The economic model for Pan-Europe is provided by the United States of America; the political model for Pan-Europe's development, by the Pan-American Union."⁴⁸ Since its origin, with the exception of the Civil War era, the United States has been a political and economic unity. Europeans should realize that the success of the American dream has been due to the existence of a common market and the political unity of the continent. They should utilize the experiences gathered in the United States and the entire American continent in their efforts to build Pan-Europe. Though Pan-Americanism was still in the process of development, it had a head start over Pan-Europeanism. The history of the development of Pan-Americanism has great significance for Pan-Europe.

Coudenhove-Kalergi believed that the League of Nations, as conceived by President Woodrow Wilson, was a utopia.⁴⁹ Two great powers, Russia and the United States, did not belong to it, and Germany was excluded from it. The League should be reorganized, he suggested, and the Europeans should work for its strengthening in order to avoid war. While World War I weakened Europe, "the War of the Future would inflict the death-blow upon it."⁵⁰ In his view, "Only Pan-European federation, by the introduction and joint guarantee of a compulsory court arbitration, can definitely secure the internal peace of Europe."

Coudenhove-Kalergi regretted the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy. While the peace of 1919 signified an advance over pre-war conditions politically, economically it was a step backward. As he put it, nationalistic demagogues "have brought disaster to millions of people, and the threat of economic ruin to the continent."⁵¹

The many opponents of Pan-Europe Coudenhove-Kalergi divided into four categories: the National Chauvinists, the Communists, the Militarists, and the Protected Industries.⁵² He realized the difficulty of combatting them with his idea that rejected conflict and promoted cooperation among European nations. His idea, indeed, did not overcome the odds represented by the mentioned

opponents and national (state) sovereignty.

Coudenhove-Kalergi realized that the greatest obstacle to the formation of a United States of Europe lay in the thousand-year-old rivalry between France and Germany.⁵³ Therefore, the Pan-Europeans would have to strive for reconciliation of these two nations in order to prevent a future catastrophe. His own efforts were directed at winning over for his idea both the French and German political leaders. He was more successful in France than in Germany.

According to an old Czech proverb, "Nobody is a prophet in his own fatherland." It applied to the fullest extent to Coudenhove-Kalergi. After publishing several articles on Paneuropa in 1922, he decided to try to persuade a well-known European personality "with vision and authority" to sponsor the Paneuropean idea. As a citizen of Czechoslovakia, he turned first to that country's president, Thomas G. Masaryk. The latter was sympathetic to the idea of European union but unwilling to associate himself with a crusade for Pan-Europe.⁵⁴

In order to obtain the blessing of the Prague government for the movement, Coudenhove-Kalergi dedicated one of the first copies of his book to Masaryk with whom he subsequently met on several occasions. Masaryk introduced him to the foreign minister Edvard Beneš, an acknowledged leader of the Little Entente and a well-known figure in international politics. According to the Count, "unlike Masaryk, Beneš was not a genuine European. Fundamentally, he was a Czech nationalist. . . . He spoke the language of Pan-Europe because he believed that to do so was good for his country. But he had no intention of sacrificing a single Czech interest on the altar of European unity."⁵⁵ While he favored "a collective guarantee of Czechoslovakia's frontiers," Beneš opposed "effective protection of the German minorities." While he favored "the dismantling of custom barriers towards Eastern Europe so as to widen the market for Czech goods," he opposed "customs union with Germany for fear of competition from that quarter." Thus Beneš's attitude toward the Pan-European movement tended to be ambiguous; "in theory he was Pan-European, but in practice a Czech nationalist."⁵⁶

After Coudenhove's manuscript on Pan-Europe came out in

Vienna in 1923, Chancellor Ignaz Seipel of Austria, who was concerned with the future of his country, was willing to support the European idea and, moreover, offered Coudenhove-Kalergi space for his projected organization in the Hofburg Palace.⁵⁷ Since the palace was the seat of the Austrian government and the movement had now an official sponsor, Coudenhove-Kalergi announced the establishment of the Paneuropean Union and a Paneuropean press with headquarters in cosmopolitan Vienna.

Coudenhove-Kalergi found prominent supporters of the European idea in France in Edouard Herriot, who had strong European impulses and became prime minister, and Aristide Briand, who became foreign minister, and Alex Léger. It was clear to the young enthusiast that in order to bring about European unity it was necessary to find support for the idea also in Germany. With France being the leader in building a European movement, Coudenhove-Kalergi tried to persuade German political leaders, first of all Chancellor Wilhelm Marx, to support the movement.⁵⁸ France was the country in search of European security and all political parties, except the Communist, supported the European idea, but in Germany the support was less pronounced, despite Coudenhove-Kalergi's efforts to persuade the Germans that they would benefit from close Paneuropean cooperation both politically and economically. Indeed, the Count pointed out that the success of the United States was due to the customs union, to the vast free market, and that the United States ought to be a model for Europe. He repeatedly stated that Europe could become as peaceful as Switzerland and as prosperous as the United States if it would unite.⁵⁹

As a result of long and careful planning by Coudenhove-Kalergi, the First Congress of the Paneuropean Union was held in Vienna, October 3-6, 1926. He had hoped to persuade a large number of European political leaders to take part in it. Since success of his plans for a united Europe depended primarily on the cooperation of France and Germany, Coudenhove-Kalergi was most anxious to have at the congress Aristide Briand, Edouard Herriot, and Paul Painlevé (the premier) of France, and Chancellor Wilhelm Marx and foreign minister Gustav Stresemann of Germany. While none of them actually attended the congress, the

three French politicians sent warm greetings and the French government was officially represented at the congress by the French minister in Vienna. The Germans were less cooperative, though Chancellor Marx sent the young Count a short telegram wishing him success and stating that the Reich Chancellor would follow the course of the congress with great interest.⁶⁰

Coudenhove-Kalergi was not completely unsuccessful in Germany. On the eve of the congress Thomas Mann joined the Paneuropean Union and Paul Löbe agreed to serve as an honorary president of the congress along with Edvard Beneš, Joseph Caillaux, Nicholas Politis, Francesco Nitti, and Ignaz Seipel. Austria seemed to be the greatest supporter of the movement. Chancellor Rudolph Ramek welcomed the delegates, including those from France, Belgium, Norway, and Czechoslovakia, where chapters of the movement had been established.⁶¹

The congress was hailed as a great success in many leading European newspapers. According to an editorial in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* of October 8, 1926, "The United States of Europe is no longer a dream; it has entered on the world of realities." Yet, the reality of the situation was such that even Coudenhove-Kalergi realized that the reserved attitude of the German government and the agitation for Anschluss were stumbling blocs for the realization of his dream. He said that the Anschluss was a Pan-German not a Paneuropean idea and that some German politicians were using Paneuropean slogans to cloak their nationalist demands for power.⁶² At the same time the Paneuropean Union was growing in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, and even in Germany new people were joining the movement.⁶³

In France Aristide Briand was an honorary president of the Paneuropean Union and a strong advocate of the European idea. Indeed, with the exception of the Communist party, political parties in France looked very favorably on the Paneuropean movement.⁶⁴ The latter had some grass roots and official support in Czechoslovakia, whose foreign policy was oriented towards France. As Coudenhove-Kalergi put it, Beneš believed in "the eventual establishment of a European Federation, but doubted whether it could be achieved in the short run . . . it was this doubt which induced him to give support to our project. Had he believed

in its immediate realization, he would probably have opposed it."⁶⁵

Since Ignaz Seipel and Karl Renner of Austria had come out openly in support of European Federation, Beneš did not wish to appear less European-minded. Therefore, he accepted "the honorary chairmanship of the Czech committee and wrote an excellent preface for the Czech edition of *Pan-Europe*." He helped to organize the committee and "secured for it the co-operation of outstanding politicians of Czech and German descent."⁶⁶ He also furnished Coudenhove-Kalergi with a diplomatic passport which was extremely useful to him. Beneš also opened for him many doors in France and other Entente states, thus helping him overcome "the double handicap" of his Austrian origin and his German mother-tongue.⁶⁷

Among the Paneuropeans were also those who advocated a gradual approach to European federation and envisaged a federation of Danubian states. Among the most active champions of Danubian federation were Milan Hodža and Václav Schuster in Czechoslovakia, Elemer Hantos and Ernő Bleier in Hungary, and Barons von Barolin and von Mises in Austria. Some of the supporters of the larger European idea argued that a Danubian federation would be a step toward a European federation.⁶⁸

The second Paneuropean Congress was held in Berlin in May, 1930. Prior to it, the French Foreign Office prepared a memorandum on a European federal system. The Briand memorandum was hailed by the congress as "the first step toward the fulfillment . . . of an European federation,"⁶⁹ and interested powers were urged to accept the French proposals. Briand's proposals were taken seriously by the British Foreign Office, but the German government's response was that some basic changes in the postwar settlement were a condition for its participation in a federal system. Replies of other countries were also conditional and, as history tells us, the Briand plan was never implemented.

The arrival of the Nazi regime in Germany was a very serious setback for Coudenhove's Paneurope. Indeed, the Nazi-projected Pan-Europe meant the domination of the continent by one nation and not a cooperation of all European nations as equals. Since Coudenhove-Kalergi was a persona non grata in the Third Reich,

he accepted French citizenship when Bohemia-Moravia became a part of it in 1939.⁷⁰ Eventually, he left Europe for the United States where he continued his work and where, in 1943, he published his autobiography, *Crusade for Pan-Europe*. In 1944 New York University appointed him Professor of History. In New York he also established contacts with many European statesmen, including General de Gaulle, and discussed with them post-war problems.⁷¹

* * * * *

Needless to say, conditions in Central Europe are different from those in the United States where the traditional policy of assimilation has resulted in a multi-cultural society speaking the same language. With its heterogeneous population and traditions of nationalistic conflicts and cooperation in national and multi-national states, federalism is the solution proposed for the unyielding problem of nationalities and minorities in Europe. While in the United States individual immigrants have been and can be assimilated, since such adjustment on the part of the immigrant is a prerequisite for finding his/her place in the new land of opportunity, it is not possible to assimilate nations or national groups possessing strong national consciousness and conscious of their national identity. Therefore, national federalism which tolerates differences in language and culture can be the only practical and feasible arrangement in East Central Europe, just as it has been the case in Switzerland. National federalism would bring economic prosperity, national freedom and regional security to nations living in the area. When the facade of national states in East Central Europe crumbled at the beginning of World War II, individuals concerned with the long-range policies in the area began to assess the national requirements of majorities and minorities in the area. Štefan Osuský, former Czechoslovak minister in Paris, presented a summary of these requirements:⁷²

Undoubtedly, the nations in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe have a right to their national liberty. But the interests of the European peoples require that those nations should not be encouraged in the dream of bringing about national uniformity within their States. Not

on national uniformity but on national liberty depends the existence and the future of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Bulgaria. It is by guaranteeing the peoples of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe their freedom of national consciousness that the foundation of the peace of Europe will be laid. Furthermore, national uniformity would mean the elimination of every authority except that of the State. In countries with different religions, languages, customs and traditions, this is not desirable. For the preservation of religious, linguistic and cultural liberty means not only that individuals have a right to profess the religion of their choice, speak the language of their mothers and live according to the traditions and customs of their ancestors; it means the practical possibility of associating together and administering their own particular affairs.

These requirements for cooperation among the nations living in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe were valid then as they are today. Let us hope that one day the small nations in the area will reject conflict and chose cooperation and that they will find a federal solution to the problem that is common to all of them: they are too weak to stand alone between the solid masses of Germans and Russians.

NOTES

¹ František Palacký and Ludwig von Löchner formulated a plan for redivision of the Habsburg Empire into national territories: German Austria, Bohemia including Slovakia, the Polish provinces, the Illyrian provinces, the Italian provinces, the South Slavic area, the Hungarian area, and the Wallachian (Romanian) provinces. This plan was endorsed by the Austrian Reichstag, dominated by federalist thinking, meeting in Kroměříž late in 1848 and early 1849 to draw up a new constitution for the empire. However, the Vienna government, after suppressing the revolution of 1848, dissolved the Reichstag and imposed a centralistic constitution. Wenzel Jaksch, *Europe's Road to Potsdam*. Translated and edited by Kurt Glaser. (New York, 1963), pp. 26-27. For details and documents see Bohuš Rieger, *Františka Palackého spisy drobné* [Small Works of František Palacký] (Prague, 1898, vol. I) pp. 59ff. Also Karel Kramář, *České státní právo* (Prague, 1896).

As the leader of the Czech National party, Palacký in 1848 was invited to join those who later met in the Frankfurt Parliament, but he refused. At that time Palacký wrote that, had the Austrian Empire not existed, it would have been necessary to create it.

- ² H. Raupach, *Der tschechische Frühnationalism* (Essen, 1939), p. 92. On May 29, 1849, Havlíček wrote in *Národní Noviny*: "We want an association of free nations in Austria, in Central Europe."
- ³ Jaksch, *Europe's Road*, pp. 70-71; also Josef Kalvoda, *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia* (New York, 1986), p. 32.
- ⁴ Peter P. Yurchak, *The Slovaks* (Whiting, Ind. 1957) p. 210; Konstantín Čulen, *Pittsburská dohoda* (Bratislava, 1937), p. 78. Also, Kalvoda, *The Genesis*, pp. 69-70.
- ⁵ Čulen, p. 177; Yurchak, pp. 212-214; Kalvoda, pp. 284-285.
- ⁶ Kalvoda, *The Genesis*, pp. 76-77.
- ⁷ František Berdych, ed., *Obrana státu a naše politické strany* (Prague, 1938), pp. 168-169.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 171.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 172. Incidentally, only two major groups in the Czechoslovak parliament voted against the law: the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, and the Sudeten German party led by Konrad Henlein. See *ibid.*, pp. 207ff.
- ¹⁰ Ira E. Bennett, "The Czechs Will Rise Again," *The Christian Science Monitor*, August 2, 1941; J.B. Kozák, *T.G. Masaryk a vznik Washingtonské deklarace v říjnu 1918* (Prague, 1968), p. 40.
- ¹¹ Kalvoda, *The Genesis*, p. 426.
- ¹² Masaryk to Wilson, November 1, 1918; Wilson to Masaryk, November 5, 1918; and Masaryk to Wilson, November 7, 1918, Woodrow Wilson Papers (The Manuscript Division, Library of Congress).
- ¹³ Kalvoda, *The Genesis*, p. 427.
- ¹⁴ Josef Kalvoda, "The Czechoslovak Problem," *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (Fall 1984), p. 245.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ Delegation Propaganda: Czechoslovak Republic, *Memoire* No. III, The Hoover Institution, quoted in Kalvoda, *The Genesis*, p. 445.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.* (*The Genesis*).
- ¹⁸ Nicholas Murray Butler, *Why War?* (New York, 1940), p. 20.
- ¹⁹ Milan Hodža, *Federation in Central Europe: Reflections and Reminiscences* (London, 1942).
- ²⁰ Michal Múdry, *Milan Hodža v Amerike* (Chicago, 1949), p. 231.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 177.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 231.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 232.
- ²⁵ R. Kravček, "Hodžův plán," *Slovanský přehled*, No. 6, 1967, pp. 347-353; also Hodža's book, *Federation*.

-
- ²⁶ Libuše Otáhalová a Milada Červinková, eds., *Dokumenty z historie československé politiky 1939-1943* (Prague 1966), vol. I, p. 293.
- ²⁷ Múdrý, *Milan Hodža v Amerike*, p. 58.
- ²⁸ Joseph M. Kirschbaum, ed., *Slovakia in the 19th & 20th Centuries* (Toronto, Ont., 1978), p. 123. See also a book by the same author, *Slovakia. Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe* (New York, 1960), pp. 78-84; Joachim Kuhl, *Federationsplane in Donauraum und in Ost mitteleuropa* (München, 1958); and Rudolf Wierer, *Der Federalism im Donauraum* (Graz-Köln, 1960).
- ²⁹ Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, *An Idea Conquers the World* (London, 1953).
- ³⁰ Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Crusade for Pan-Europe. Autobiography of a Man and a Movement* (New York, 1943).
- ³¹ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *An Idea Conquers*, p. 109.
- ³² *Ibid.*, p. 91.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.
- ³⁴ Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Pan-Europe* (New York, 1926).
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xv.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 58.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 62.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 67-69
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 87.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 186-190.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-147.
- ⁵⁴ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Crusade for Pan-Europe*, p. 88.
- ⁵⁵ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *An Idea Conquers*, p. 103.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.
- ⁵⁷ Carl H. Pegg, *Evolution of the European Idea, 1914-1932* (Chapel Hill and London, 1983) p. 29.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁶⁴ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *An Idea Conquers*, p. 104.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁶⁸ Pegg, *Evolution of the European Idea*, p. 99.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

⁷⁰ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Crusade for Pan-Europe*, pp. 208-209.

⁷¹ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *An Idea Conquers*, pp. 254-255.

⁷² Štefan Osuský, *The Contemporary Review*, November, 1941, pp. 280-281, cited in Oscar I. Janowsky, *Nationalities and National Minorities (With special Reference to East-Central Europe)* (New York, 1945), pp. 167-168.

Slovak Immigration to the United States and its Relation to the American Socialist and Labor Movements

M. MARK STOLARIK

If one looks at the large number of books and articles that Slovak Marxist historians have written about Slovak immigrants and their relation to the socialist and labor movements, one will get the impression that most Slovak immigrants to the United States joined socialist organizations and took a leading role in the American labor movement.¹ There is very little evidence to support such conclusions. As I will demonstrate in this paper, most Slovak immigrants came to the United States as single young men who wanted to make their "fortunes" and return home and their leaders were more concerned with promoting Slovak nationalism than with any socialist or labor ideology.

Slovaks left their homeland in Hungary in the 19th century for three basic reasons: lack of land, lack of industry and lack of opportunity. While serfdom was abolished during the Revolution of 1848, there was no corresponding land reform. Therefore, the nobility (ten per cent of the population) continued to hold more than half of the best arable land. The vast majority of freed serfs held fewer than five hectares of land and soon they began to break up even these meager holdings among their children. Furthermore, the Kingdom of Hungary, unlike the Austrian part of the Empire, did not promote much industry (the nobility preferred the "rustic" life to pollution and grime) and, hence, the growing number of landless peasants found it increasingly difficult to make ends meet.² In addition, the Slovaks had only a tiny middle class which

was engaged in an uneven struggle with the Hungarian government over the issue of 'Magyarization' (the forcible assimilation of non-Magyar nationalities by the Magyars). This small number of individuals, faced by government discrimination, could not possibly either build up industry large enough to employ all the job-seekers or force the government into land reform.³ Therefore, by the 1870s it had become common practice for Slovak peasants to migrate each summer to the Hungarian (and in some instances Austrian) lowlands and take in the harvest of the wealthy nobles. Others, particularly from Trenčín county, had begun to wander all over Europe as tinkers who would offer to fix household implements, sharpen knives and scissors and do other odd jobs for the few pennies tossed them by sympathetic housewives. Others still sought work in the booming metropolises of Vienna and Budapest.⁴

Meanwhile, after the American Civil War had ended, the United States of America began to industrialize in earnest. The railroad, coal, steel and oil industries began to greatly expand and they required large numbers of cheap, unskilled laborers, to make them profitable. American industrialists refused to pay the Irish and other immigrants who were already in America a decent wage, and the industrialists also rejected the alternatives of Black labor. Instead, they sent agents to Europe to seek workers who would settle for wages of around \$1.50 a day and the agents found such people in eastern and southern Europe.⁵

To a Slovak peasant, who could not make a living on five hectares of land, and who earned only the equivalent of 15 to 30 cents a day on a noble's estate, if he could find the work, \$1.50 a day was a very handsome salary. Therefore, a few Slovaks responded to the entreaties of railroad agents (who advanced them the \$70.00 it would cost to make the trip) in the 1870s and went to America. By then steamships began to carry immigrants across the Ocean in the relatively short time of two weeks.⁶ And, while the work on the railroads, in the mines or mills was long and hard, the Slovaks put up with all these hardships because they had not come to stay. Instead, the vast majority were single young men (or newly-married) who came to make their 'fortunes' (usually \$1,000) and then hoped to return home, buy enough land to make

a living, and settle down to the good life in Hungary. Living in cramped boarding houses, the frugal Slovaks managed to pay off the cost of the trip in six months and after that they began to send money home to support their families and to also bring additional relatives to America.⁷ Once this process got underway the trickle of Slovaks turned into a deluge in the 1880s and 1890s and peaked in 1905 when over 50,000 made the voyage. Altogether 650,000 Slovaks migrated to the United States between 1870 and 1924 (when immigration was largely halted by the U.S. Congress) and 500,000 eventually chose to remain in the New World.⁸ Those who did then sent for their wives and children. Most Slovaks settled in the industrial Northeast and Midwest, half in Pennsylvania and the rest in New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan and Minnesota.⁹

While life was more livable for Slovaks in the New World than in the Old, they did soon come to realize that they were being exploited and started to strike. The first recorded strike by Slovaks in the United States was in Bessemer, Pennsylvania in January of 1886 when 300 men, led by Štefan Stanek, walked off the job because the mine operators refused their modest request for an increase from 27 cents per wagon of coal produced to 30 cents per wagon. The mine owners decided to disperse the strikers with local police forces but the miners' wives saved the day by hurling stones at the police and preventing them from making many arrests.¹⁰ After this Slovaks were found participating in all the major strikes that affected the coal and steel industries, whether in the great Connellsville coal and coke strike of 1891, the Homestead steel strike of 1892, the Anthracite coal strike of 1894, the Lattimer coal strike of 1897, the Anthracite strikes of 1900 and 1902, the Bethlehem Steel strike of 1910, the Westmoreland coal strike of 1911-1912 and the 1919 "Hunky" steel strike.¹¹ In the Lattimer strike, which turned into a massacre when sheriff's deputies opened fire upon 1,000 peaceful marching strikers, six Slovaks were killed, along with eight Poles and two Lithuanians, and 35 other workers were wounded.¹²

In view of the Slovak willingness to strike for better wages and conditions, one might conclude that they were ripe for recruitment by socialist ideologies and organizations. Such was not the

case. As early as 1890 the editor of the workers' weekly *Slovák v Amerike* (The Slovak in America) denounced socialism for two reasons: he charged that socialists advocated the violent overthrow of the capitalist system, an action which he deemed immoral; and socialism propagated internationalism, which to the beleaguered Slovaks who were fighting 'Magyarization' meant national suicide.¹³ A.S. Ambrose, the founder and editor of *Slovák v Amerike*, had been an organizer of the ill-fated Knights of Labor, who made the first attempt to create an industrial union of unskilled workers in the United States in the 1880s.¹⁴ Thus, while Ambrose was sympathetic to the plight of the workers, he rejected socialism and most other Slovak leaders in America followed suit. In a later article the Reverend Štefan Furdek, who was the most respected of Slovak Catholic clergymen in America, rejected socialism as well, principally because he felt it violated human nature — "people are not sheep" — and also because it opposed organized religion and wanted to root out belief in God.¹⁵ Since both secular and clerical leaders of Slovak-Americans opposed socialism in the United States, it had little chance of success among the masses.

This is not to say that socialist societies and newspapers did not arise among American Slovaks. They did, but when compared to other Slovak organizations, the socialist ones came relatively late and in such small numbers that they made very little impact upon Slovak-American life. For instance, A.S. Ambrose joined with P.V. Rovnianek (an ex-seminarian) to found the first nation-wide National Slovak Society of the United States and Canada in 1890 (between 1882 and 1890 more than 40 local fraternal societies had been established by American Slovaks).¹⁶ Besides providing for fraternal-benefit insurance, the National Slovak Society became the leading nationalist and second-largest Slovak fraternal in the United States by 1918.¹⁷ The largest was the First Catholic Slovak Union, also founded in 1890, but by the Reverend Štefan Furdek. Its goals were fraternal-benefit insurance for its members, and defense of the Catholic faith and the Slovak nation, as embodied in its slogan "Za Boha a národ" (For God and the Nation).¹⁸

Since American Slovaks had interests that went beyond those espoused by the National Slovak Society and the First Catholic

Slovak Union, they established even more fraternal societies. The two aforementioned societies initially admitted only men. Therefore, the wives of the men in these societies established the *Živena* (Giver of Life) Beneficial Union in 1891 and the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union in 1892.¹⁹ Lutherans followed suit with the Slovak Evangelical Union in 1892.²⁰ A regional group founded the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union in 1893.²¹ Militant nationalists established the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol in 1896 (from which devout Catholics split off to found the larger Slovak Catholic Sokol in 1905)²² and even Slovak Calvinists, a tiny minority, founded their Slovak Calvin Presbyterian Union in 1901 (all of these later established women's counterparts).²³ By 1918 twelve of the largest nation-wide Slovak societies in the United States enrolled over 200,000 members. The religious ones led with a total of 145,053 (51,817 in the First Catholic Slovak Union), with Catholics enrolling 133,904 and Lutherans 11,149. Secular societies had 69,315 members, and the National Slovak Society led these with 29,118.²⁴ By 1940 these societies, largely by enrolling their members' children, had doubled their combined membership to over 400,000.

Meanwhile, a few isolated Slovak socialist organizations appeared at the turn of the century. The most important one arose in Chicago in 1902. In that year Štefan Martinček arrived from Budapest, where he had been a member of the Hungarian Socialist Party since 1897 and editor of the Slovak Socialist newspaper *Nová doba* in 1898-1899. He had also helped organize socialist cells among Slovaks in the southernmost counties of the Banát and Bačka. However, by 1902 he tired of the Hungarian government's refusal to allow the creation of a Slovak Workers' Society on the old pretext that "there is no Slovak nation," and left for Chicago where a friend had preceded him. Soon after his arrival Martinček organized the First Slovak Workers Educational Society "Rovnosť" (Equality), which affiliated with the Czech Workers' Section of the Socialist party of America. The latter had been founded in 1901.²⁵ In the next few years other Slovak socialist societies sprang up in Cleveland, Newark, N.J., and New York City, and elsewhere. By 1911 these various societies decided to federate into the Slovak Section of the American Socialist Party.²⁶

The aim of all of them was to try to spread the socialist ideology among their people and help the Socialist Party win as many elections as possible in order to eventually turn to the United States into a socialist country.

Meanwhile, Martinček also wished to establish a Slovak Workers' (fraternal-benefit) Society but found too few potential followers and had to postpone this project until 1915. In that year he managed to persuade 60 members of the Slovak Socialist Section to meet in Newark and organize the Slovak Workers' Society. By the time of its first convention in 1917 it had enrolled 507 members.²⁷ It slowly grew to 11,107 by 1939 by actively recruiting not only among Slovaks but also among Czechs, Rusins and even Magyars, thereby giving credence to the Slovak nationalist charge that Slovak socialists were not good Slovaks.²⁸ The tremendous unemployment of the Great Depression also contributed to its growth. On the other hand, the Slovak Section of the Socialist Party in 1919, and the Slovak Workers' Society in 1920 joined the III International and thereby adopted the communist cause, losing significant numbers of members in the process.²⁹

If one looks at the Slovak-American newspaper press, one will likewise find a dearth of Slovak-American socialist newspapers. The first Slovak-American newspaper was founded in Pittsburgh in 1885 as a commercial venture to provide news from home.³⁰ By 1918 121 Slovak-language newspapers had sprung up in this country (although only 41 were still publishing by then) and of 93 newspapers on which there is information regarding their ideology, 54% were Slovak nationalist, 18% were Magyarone, 17% had no political orientation, 4% were "Czechoslovak," 4% were socialist and 2% were neutral. Furthermore, in terms of religious orientation, 79% had none, 15% were Roman Catholic, 5% were Lutheran and one was Calvinist. Thus, the Slovak-American press was, by-and-large, secular and nationalist between 1885 and 1918.³¹

Only four Slovak-American socialist newspapers appeared between 1885 and 1918, and only one survived. The first sprang up as the weekly *Robotník* (Worker) in Connellsville, Pennsylvania, in 1889, but little is known about it and it died a quick death.³² The second was founded by the brilliant ex-Jesuit (he

could speak twelve languages) František Pucher-Čiernovodský in 1894. Entitled *Fakľa* (Torch), this New York monthly lasted for only nine months because there was not enough of a demand for it.³³ The third (and only successful) attempt to establish a Slovak-American socialist newspaper occurred in Chicago in 1906 when a small group, led by Štefan Martinček, established the monthly *Rovnosť ľudu* (Equality of the people). It became a weekly in 1908 and a daily in 1926. The newspaper changed its name to *Ľudový denník* (The People's Daily) in 1935 and to *Ľudové noviny* (The People's News) in 1945; it folded in 1981.³⁴ The fourth (and last) attempt to establish a Slovak socialist newspaper in America occurred in New York in 1914 when a local group founded the *Hlas svobody* (Voice of Freedom) to principally serve as the official (fraternal) organ of the about-to-be organized Slovak Workers Society. It lasted only to 1917 because it opposed World War I and such a stand became untenable after the United States entered the war the same year.³⁵

Having surveyed Slovak immigration to the United States and the establishment of two of its three principal institutions, fraternal-benefit societies and newspapers (the other institution was the parish church), the question that now arises is why was the socialist movement among American Slovaks so weak, especially when compared to other ethnic groups who also came from southern or eastern Europe? We know, for instance, that the Czechs, Slovenes and Finns had very vigorous socialist organizations and newspapers.³⁶ Why did not the Slovaks?

The answers are very complex and involve the type of immigrant who came to America, what region he/she came from, who the leaders were, their hopes and aspirations, and the wishes of the immigrants themselves. As we have already seen, most Slovak immigrants who came to the United States in the 19th century were single young men who hoped to make their fortunes and return home. Furthermore, the vast majority came from eastern Slovakia, particularly from the counties of Spiš, Šariš, Zemplín and Abov. This was the most over-populated and economically depressed area of Slovakia and also the weakest in national feeling.³⁷ The principal concerns of the peasants who left this area, whether seasonally to the Hungarian lowlands, or across the Ocean

to America, was to find work, save their money, help their families survive and, perhaps, even buy some land back home. Until the 20th century they had virtually no knowledge of or contact with socialist ideology. Hungary itself had only a weak socialist movement that got underway in the late 19th century, principally in Budapest.³⁸

Immigrants from western Slovakia, particularly from Bratislava and Nitra counties, were different. They held more land than their counterparts in the east, were more nationally-conscious, had frequent contacts with their neighbors the Czechs, and often worked on the estates of rich Austrian nobles. They encountered socialist ideas in both the Czech lands and in Austria (Austria had the third-largest socialist movement in terms of votes in Europe in 1912) and brought such ideas with them to America.³⁹ Thus, not only did František Pucher-Čiarnovodský, the founder of the socialist *Fakľa* (1894) hail from Burský Svätý Jur, in Bratislava county, but the majority of the members of the Slovak Workers Society also came from western Slovakia.⁴⁰ That region, on the other hand, sent only a small number of immigrants to America, and, hence, the “pool” of potential Slovak socialists in the United States was very small.⁴¹

American Slovak leaders, whether secular or clerical, tended to come from central Slovakia. When one looks at the priests, fraternal leaders and journalists who presented themselves as the leaders of American Slovaks, one is bound to notice (as did Hungarian government leaders) that the majority came from the central Slovak counties, particularly from Orava and Turiec — the most nationalist of all Slovak counties. Indeed, the intellectual center of Slovak nationalism in the 19th century was the little town of Turčiansky Svätý Martin. Here the Slovaks established their ‘Matica slovenská’ (a combination of National Library and National Academy) in 1863 (the Hungarian government closed it in 1875) and also their ‘Muzeálna Slovenská spoločnosť’ (Slovak Museum Society) in 1893.⁴² Slovak-American leaders who originated here, such as the Reverend Štefan Furdek (Orava), mentioned above, or Ján Spevák, (Turiec), the second publisher of *Slovák v Amerike*, or Matúš Jankola (Orava) founder of the first Slovak-American religious order of the Sisters of Saints Cyril and Methodius, or

Albert Mamatey (Turiec) wartime president of the Slovak League of America, were first and foremost Slovak nationalists.⁴³ To all of them socialism was anathema because it preached internationalism which, one of them pointed out, meant for the Slovaks national suicide. Therefore, while most Slovak leaders in America were sympathetic to the plight of Slovak workers, they steered them away from socialist ideology. For instance, while the publisher of *Slovák v Amerike* might condemn the Pennsylvania state constabulary as "State Cossacks" for their brutality in breaking up a 1912 strike,⁴⁴ his colleague Jozef Hušek (From Liptov, in central Slovakia) in the Cleveland monthly *Kritika* would blame the violence of the Colorado miners' strike of 1914 upon "socialist agitators" (in this case the Industrial Workers of the World).⁴⁵

Furthermore, at least one powerful Slovak leader was corrupted by greed. P.V. Rovnianek, a co-founder of the National Slovak Society and for many years editor of the first and largest Slovak-American newspaper, *Amerikánsko-Slovenské noviny* (American-Slovak News), allowed himself to be bribed by mine owners during the Connellsville coal strike of 1891. Rovnianek told the miners in his paper that their cause was hopeless and urged them to return to work. The strike collapsed shortly thereafter.⁴⁶ Thus, whether they were concerned with the cause of Slovak nationalism, with keeping their people religious, or with lining their pockets with money, most Slovak-American leaders did nothing to advance the cause of socialism among their people. On the contrary, they opposed it whenever they felt it was necessary. Slovak socialists in America could only lament this stand by "our conservative and clerical leaders."⁴⁷

Furthermore, Slovak socialists (and later communists) in America eventually fell victim to the allure of capitalism. When one looks at the almanacs published by Slovak socialists, one will notice a slow but steady trend away from socialist or communist zealotry. For instance, the first Slovak socialist *Robotnícky Kalendár*, published in 1914, rather than having a religious calendar at the beginning, had one featuring secular heroes; it did not list Christmas; it had many attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church, whether in articles, jokes or cartoons; and it carried only three advertisements, two by fellow-socialists who were selling

artificial limbs and socialist newspapers.⁴⁸ The contents of these almanacs started to change with the second issue (1915) which restored the Roman Catholic and Lutheran calendars, as well as Christmas, and also printed twenty-four advertisements by small businessmen, most of them socialists.⁴⁹ By the time the 1946 *Ľudový Kalendár* (it changed its name in 1935) appeared, it carried Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Greek Catholic and American Saints and heroes, it actually listed Christmas as the birth of Christ, and it had no anti-clerical articles whatever. Indeed, it published the pictures of two Roman Catholic nuns who were daughters of its communist readers! Furthermore, it published 405 advertisements of small businessmen, many of whom were also ostensibly communists.⁵⁰ Thus, even though the United States government forced the Slovak Workers Society (which had joined the International Workers' Order in 1931) to disband as a "subversive" society under the McCarren-Walter Act in 1953, the seeds of its dissolution really lay in the success of many of its members in becoming entrepreneurs and also in their children's apparent lack of interest in continuing the old struggle.⁵¹

In view of the relatively late appearance of Slovak socialists in America, their small number, and insignificant organizations, one is left wondering why Slovak Marxist historians have made so much of them. One reason may simply be pride in the fact that the Slovak socialist movement occurred on both sides of the Atlantic. A more plausible reason is, I think, the fact that Slovak-American socialists helped to organize the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. While most Slovak-American socialists had become communists by 1920, this kind of split had not yet occurred in the newly-created Czechoslovakia. Therefore, Slovak-American communists sent Jozef Schiffel of Newark, N.J., and Marek Čulen of Chicago (both western Slovaks from the Záhorie region) to Slovakia to size up the situation and help lead their comrades to the "right path." Schiffel quickly had himself elected secretary of the more radical wing of the socialists and called a meeting of fellow-radicals in Ľubochňa in January, 1921, which his colleague Marek Čulen chaired. Čulen was then elected president of the "Action Committee" which planned the organizing meeting of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in May. At this

meeting Jozef Schiffel was elected to the Central Committee of the newly-formed Czechoslovak Communist Party. Schiffel later returned to the United States while Čulen remained in Slovakia.⁵² Thus, just as American Slovaks had helped create the Czechoslovak Republic during World War I, so they helped to establish the Czechoslovak Communist Party.⁵³ And, this may be the principal reason why Slovak Marxist historians have paid so much attention to the Slovak-American socialist movement which, in the context of Slovak-American history, was relatively unimportant.

Meanwhile, what about the Slovak workers and their reactions to labor organizing? This is largely 'terra incognita' at the moment. Paul Krause recently wrote a fine article about the willingness of Slovaks to join with their Anglo-American fellow-workers in organizing and striking at Homestead in 1892.⁵⁴ I have previously given examples of the willingness of Slovak workers to strike, both in this paper and in my doctoral dissertation.⁵⁵ And, in my recent study of Slovaks in Bethlehem, I found them joining in the 1910 strike against Bethlehem Steel and again in 1941.⁵⁶ In the latter case they also helped organize the Congress of Industrial Organizations in Bethlehem, just as Thomas Bell, the Slovak-American writer had his hero do in his novel *Out of this Furnace*.⁵⁷

On the other hand, Slovaks were also guilty of scabbing and joining company-controlled unions. The Slovak press occasionally reported such practices, whether or not it approved of them.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Slovaks in Bethlehem joined company-sponsored unions in the 1920's and such activities were detrimental to true union organizing.⁵⁹

To complicate matters further, American labor organizers were not always receptive to foreigners. The Knights of Labor had tried to organize an industrial union in the coal fields in the 1880's and did welcome immigrants such as A.S. Ambrose into their ranks, but the union ultimately failed due to poor leadership. In the 1890's skilled workers organized themselves into the American Federation of Labor and systematically excluded unskilled immigrants from their ranks, particularly in the steel mills, and this was one of the main reasons for the failure of the Bethlehem Steel

strike of 1910.⁶¹ Only the United Mine Workers and the Industrial Workers of the World, which appeared in the early 1900's, successfully recruited and organized immigrant unskilled laborers, the Slovaks among them.⁶² While the UMW grew into a large and powerful union, the IWW was destroyed by the United States government during World War I because, as a socialist-syndicalist organization, it opposed American entry into World War I.⁶³ Only in the 1930's, during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "New Deal," did labor organizers not have to worry about government interference in their efforts to establish a union. That was when the Congress of Industrial Organizations finally managed to organize unions in most of America's heavy industries.⁶⁴

While Slovaks did join the UMW and the CIO in large numbers, the role played by Slovaks in the creation of these unions remains largely unknown. In my research I ran across no Slovak equivalent to Terrence Powderly (the leader of the Knights of Labor) Big Bill Heywood (a leader of the Industrial Workers of the World), John L. Lewis (a leader of the United Mine Workers) or even a Helen Gurley Flynn (an IWW organizer) or a Giuseppe Ettor, another IWW organizer. There may well have been such figures at a lower level of organizing because Anglo-Americans, and later Irish-Americans, tended to dominate the leadership of America's labor unions.⁶⁵ If there were Slovaks who took a lead in organizing labor unions at local levels, they remain to be discovered.

Thus, we have seen that socialism and socialist organizations did not attract the vast majority of Slovak-Americans, in spite of what Slovak Marxist historians have written. Furthermore, Slovak-Americans cannot be said to have taken a leading role in the organization of American labor unions, although they may have played minor roles at local levels, and if so, these roles remain to be discovered. Various factors such as the place of origin of the majority of Slovak-Americans (eastern Slovakia), their leadership (conservative and clerical), the weakness of socialism in Hungary, and the initial desire of Slovak-Americans to make their "fortunes" and return home, all worked against the establishment of strong socialist and labor movements among Slovak-Americans.

NOTES

- ¹ See for example Miloš Gosiorovský, "K podielu americko-slovenského proletariátu na vzniku ČSR," in the collection of essays *Ke vzniku ČSR* (Prague, 1958), 171-84 and by the same author "K histórii Slovenského robotníckeho spolku v USA," in *Zborník Filozofickej Fakulty Univerzity Komenského, historica*, 11-12 (Bratislava, 1962), 40-74, and "František Pucher-Čiernovodský a robotnícke hnutie," in *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA* (Bratislava, 1970), 197-207. While Gosiorovský set the tone, others followed. Examples are František Bielik and Štefan Veselý, "Zápisnice slovenských politických organizácií v Spojených štátoch amerických," in *Slováci v zahraničí*, 3 (Martin, 1979), 147-166; František Bielik *et. al.*, *Slováci vo Svete*, 2 (Martin, 1980); Ondrej Kuteš, "Spomienky na život Slovákov vo Whitingu v štáte Indiana a môj príchod do USA," in *Slováci v zahraničí*, 8 (Martin, 1982), 127-131; Ivan Poljak, "Štefan Martinček," in *Slováci v zahraničí*, 4-5 (Martin, 1979), 305; Ján Sirácky, "Pokrokové tradície zahraničných Slovákov a ich vyvrcholenie v období boja proti fašizmu počas druhej svetovej vojny," *Slováci v zahraničí*, 3 (Martin, 1979), 7-25; and Sirácky, "Súčasný stav a problematika výskumu dejín zahraničných Slovákov," in Bielik *et. al.*, *Vyst'ahovalectvo a život krajanov vo svete* (Martin, 1982), 49-58.
- ² Karol Rebro, "Agrárne reformy v habsburskej monarchii od začiatku 18. stor. do roku 1848 s osobitým zreteľom na Slovensko," *Historické štúdie* XIII (1968), 11-13; and Endre Arató, "K hospodárskym dejinám Slovenska od roku 1848 do 1900," *Historický časopis*, I (No. 3, 1953), 432.
- ³ Arató, *Ibid.*, 480-86.
- ⁴ Ján Hanzlík, "Začiatky vyst'ahovalectva zo Slovenska do USA a jeho priebeh až do roku 1918, jeho príčiny a následky," in *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA* (Bratislava, 1970), 55; See also *Národný hlásnik* (Skalica, June 30, 1869), 166 and (February 8, 1881), 1.
- ⁵ Emily Greene Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (New York, 1910), 239. See also *Obzor* (Skalica), June 25, 1881; *Národné noviny* (Martin), November 14, 1882, 1; February 24, 1887, 4; March 17, 1892, 3; May 3, 1898, 1; *Amerikánsko-Slovenské noviny* (Pittsburgh), April 26, 1900, 9; and July 4, 1901; see also the governor's correspondence in the Slovak State Archives for Abov county, Košice, 460/1900.
- ⁶ Balch, *Ibid.*, 285.
- ⁷ M. Mark Stolarik, "Slovak Migration from Europe to North America, 1870-1918," in *Slovak Studies*, XX (Rome, 1980), 34-35.
- ⁸ Ján Svetoň, "Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo v období uhorského kapitalizmu," *Ekonomický časopis*, IV (No. 2, 1956), 171-79; and *Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920, Vol. II, Population: General Report and Analytical Tables* (Washington, 1922), 973.
- ⁹ *Fourteenth Census*, *Ibid.*, 984.
- ¹⁰ *Národné noviny*, February 9, 1886, 3.
- ¹¹ Gustáv Maršall-Petrovský to Julo Kuchta, October 11, 1894, in the Matica slovenská's Literary Archives, Martin, 37-060; *Národné noviny*, June 30, 1884, 3; August 9, 1894; *Slovák v Amerike* (New York), September 30, 1897, 2; October 7, 1897, 1; March 31, 1898, 4; *Národný Kalendár* (Pittsburgh), 1903, 49-64; *Slovák v Amerike*, July 7, 1908, 1; *Národný Kalendár*, 1912, 241-250; M. Mark Stolarik, *Growing Up on the South Side:*

Three Generations of Slovaks in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1880-1976 (Lewisburg, 1985), 97-98.

- ¹² The Most complete account of the Lattimer strike is Michael Novak's *The Guns of Lattimer: The True Story of a Massacre and Trial, August 1897-March 1898* (New York, 1978).

¹³ As cited in *Národné noviny*, November 6, 1890, 2.

¹⁴ *Národný Kalendár*, 1912, 58-62.

¹⁵ *Kalendár Jednota* (Cleveland, 1910), 190-98.

¹⁶ P.V. Rovnianek, *Zápisky za živa pochovaného* (Pittsburgh, 1924), 128-130; Ignác Gessay, "Spolky pred organisáciami," *Národný Kalendár*, 1911, 67.

¹⁷ Thomas Čapek, Jr., *The Slovaks in America* (New York, 1921), 88-9.

¹⁸ Jozef Paučo, *75 rokov Prvej Katolíckej Slovenskej Jednoty* (Cleveland, 1965), passim.

¹⁹ *Pamätnica k zlatému jubileu Živeny, 1891-1941* (Pittsburgh, 1941), passim; and *Jednota* (Cleveland, December 9, 1908), 4.

²⁰ Ján Pankuch, *Dejiny Clevelandských a Lakewoodských Slovákov* (Cleveland, 1930), 11.

²¹ *Amerikánsko-Slovenské noviny*, July 4, 1896, 1.

²² *Ibid.*, July 13, 1896, 1; and Gusto Košík, "Prvé desaťročie našej Jednoty," *Sborník Rímsko a Grécko Katolíckej Telocvičnej Jednoty Sokol* (Passaic, N.J., 1916), 35-51.

²³ Frank Uherka, "Krátky prehľad S.K.P.J. Jednoty," *Kalendár pre Slovenských Kalvínov* (Pittsburgh, 1927), 37-8.

²⁴ Čapek, *op. cit.*

²⁵ Štefan Martinček, "Z minulosti slovenského robotníckeho hnutia," *Robotnícky Kalendár* (Chicago, 1927), 25-28.

²⁶ Gosiorovský, "K histórii Slovenského robotníckeho spolku v USA," *op. cit.*, 45.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 41 and 56; and Ivan Poljak and Eva Fordinálová, "Slovenské robotnícke hnutie v Spojených štátoch amerických," in František Bielik *et. al.*, *Slováci vo svete*, 2 (Martin, 1980), 124.

²⁹ Poljak and Fordinálová, *Ibid.*, and *Robotnícky Kalendár*, 1930, 38.

³⁰ Konštantín Čulen, *Slovenské časopisy v Amerike* (Cleveland, 1970), 29-32.

³¹ M. Mark Stolarik, "At Home Abroad: The Slovak-American Press, 1885-1918," in Owen V. Johnson, ed., *Mobilizing the Mobilized: The Role and Functions of the Mass Media in Eastern Europe* (Forthcoming).

³² Čulen, *op. cit.*, 101.

³³ *Ibid.*, 41-2; Gosiorovský, "František Pucher-Čiernovodský" *op. cit.*

³⁴ Čulen, *op. cit.*, 104-07; For a general discussion of the Slovak-American press see M. Mark Stolarik, "The Slovak-American Press," in Sally M. Miller ed., *The Ethnic Press in the United States* (Westport, Conn., 1987), 353-68.

³⁵ Čulen, *op. cit.*, 47.

³⁶ In a pamphlet entitled *Socialist Party Meeting National Committee, May, 1915: Reports of Foreign Federations* (No publisher, place or date given), in the papers of the Slovene National Benefit Society Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota,

groups such as the Czechs, Slovenes and Finns were reported with tens of thousands of members but the Slovaks had only 751. See also the articles about these groups in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

- ³⁷ Ladislav Tajták, "Východoslovenské vyst'ahovalectvo do prvej svetovej vojny," *Nové obzory* (Košice, III, 1961), 221-47.
- ³⁸ Gabriel Louis Jaraj, *La Question Sociale et le Socialisme en Hongrie* (Paris, 1909), 54-8; and Martinček, *op. cit.*, 25.
- ³⁹ Poljak & Fordinálová in *Slováci vo svete*, 2, *op. cit.*, 115; Zoltán Sárközi, "Príspevok k dejinám slovenských poľnohospodárskych sezónnych robotníkov (1848-1914)," *Historický časopis* (Bratislava, 1964), 12, 75-103; and *Robotnícky Kalendár*, (1914), in which the editors give the world-wide socialist vote in 1912 as follows: Germany, 4,238,919; France, 1,120,000; Austria, 1,041,948; USA 905,768; Finland, 330,000; Hungary 80,000.
- ⁴⁰ Gosiorovský, "František Pucher-Čiernovodský," *op. cit.*, and Poljak and Fordinálová, *op. cit.*
- ⁴¹ František Bielík & Elo Rákoš, *Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo: Dokumenty I, do roku 1918* (Bratislava, 1969), 30.
- ⁴² Július Mésároš a kolektív, *Dejiny Slovenska II, od roku 1848 do roku 1900* (Bratislava, 1968), 236-306; Monika Glettler, *Pittsburg-Wien-Budapest: Program und Praxis der Nationalitätenpolitik bei der Auswanderung der Ungarischen Slowaken nach Amerika um 1900* (Vienna, 1980), 208-17.
- ⁴³ See Jozef Paučo, *Slovenskí priekopníci v Amerike* (Cleveland, 1972) for the biographies of Furdek (72-127), Jankola (208-22), and Mamatey (269-75), and Čulen, *Slovenské časopisy op. cit.*, 125, for the origins of Ján Spevák.
- ⁴⁴ *Slovák v Amerike*, May 14, 1912, 1.
- ⁴⁵ *Kritika*, May 20, 1914, 2.
- ⁴⁶ Gustáv Maršall-Petrovský to Julo Kuchta, *op. cit.*, and *Slovák v Amerike*, July 7, 1908, 1.
- ⁴⁷ *Robotnícky Kalendár*, 1914, 15.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, passim.
- ⁴⁹ *Robotnícky Kalendár*, 1915, passim.
- ⁵⁰ *Ludový Kalendár*, 1946, passim.
- ⁵¹ Gosiorovský, "K histórii Slovenského robotníckeho spolku," *op. cit.*, 70-71. Even the covers of the Slovak Communist Almanac cited above changed dramatically over the years. The 1932 cover, for instance, featured a very revolutionary scene of workers storming the barricades, whereas the 1950 cover showed a rather bourgeois photograph of a beautiful Slovak mother and child.
- ⁵² Gosiorovský, "K histórii Slovenského robotníckeho spolku," *op. cit.*, 52-3.
- ⁵³ For the story of the World War I liberation movement see my *The Role of American Slovaks in the Creation of Czecho-Slovakia, 1914-1918* (Rome, *Slovak Studies*, VIII, 1968).
- ⁵⁴ Paul Krause, "Labor Republicanism and 'Za Chleboom': Anglo-Americans and Slavic Solidarity in Homestead," in Dirk Hoerder ed., "*Struggle a Hard Battle*": *Essays on Working-Class Immigrants* (DeKalb, Ill., 1986), 121-42.

-
- ⁵⁵ See above, page 4 and Stolarik, "Slovak Migration from Europe to North America," *op. cit.*, 65-7.
- ⁵⁶ Stolarik, *Growing Up on the South Side*, *op. cit.*, 97-9.
- ⁵⁷ Thomas Bell, *Out of this Furnace* (Boston, 1941), 395-404.
- ⁵⁸ *Národné noviny*, August 13, 1892, 3; June 30, 1894, 3; and *Národný Kalendár*, 1912, 246-50.
- ⁵⁹ Stolarik, *Growing Up*, *op. cit.*, 98.
- ⁶⁰ For an excellent article on immigrants and the American labor movement see David Brody's contribution "Labor" in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, *op. cit.*, 609-18.
- ⁶¹ Robert Hessen, *Steel Titan: The Life of Charles M. Schwab* (New York, 1976), 194-208.
- ⁶² *Národný Kalendár*, 1903, 49-64; *Slovák v Amerike*, April 11, 1905, 4; March 27, 1906, 1; July 30, 1907, 1; *Národný Kalendár*, 1908, 144-56; *Ibid.*, 1912, 241-50.
- ⁶³ For the story of the IWW see Melvin Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World* (Chicago, 1969). The section on their destruction appears on pages 350-462.
- ⁶⁴ The role of the CIO in organizing many of America's heavy industries was outlined by Sidney Lens in *The Labor Wars: From the Molly Maguires to the Sitdowns* (Garden City, N.J., 1973), 285-375.
- ⁶⁵ David Brody makes this point about the ethnic composition of America's labor leaders in his article, cited above, on pages 611 and 615.

The Slovak National Catholic Church, Passaic, New Jersey, and the Jeczusko Affair

RAYMOND J. KUPKE

INTRODUCTION

In the Dundee section of Passaic, New Jersey there are four churches in an area of nine city blocks: Holy Name Slovak National Catholic Cathedral, St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, St. Michael the Archangel Ruthenian Catholic Cathedral, and Sts. Peter and Paul Russian Orthodox Cathedral. Although this listing represents four diverse denominations, the members of the four parishes are descended from immigrants from the same villages in what are today Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and indeed family ties run across all four congregations.¹

Commenting on an article about Our Lady of Mercy Slovak Parish in Cleveland, Ohio, which existed in a schismatic state from the Roman Catholic Church from 1917 to 1922, Slovak historian Mark Stolarik observes,

It is interesting to note that in the spirit of "consensus" history a recent article in *Jednota* (January 19, 1972, p. 1) about Our Lady of Mercy Church, makes no mention of this schism. Contemporary Slovak editors avoid religious controversy at all costs.²

When one delves into the Slovak religious history of Passaic, Stolarik's observation is amply born out. Upon reading the available jubilee books³ one hardly notices a mention of the year 1922. Yet in 1922, just as the rupture in Cleveland's Slovak community was being healed, a schism developed in Passaic's Slovak

community which would effect a permanent division in the community, and create an unusual footnote in American religious history — a cathedral without a diocese, a one-parish “denomination” with Roman Catholic usages and Polish National Catholic affiliation.⁴

The religious history of Passaic is amazingly complex. It is caught up in currents on both sides of the Atlantic and involves merchants and politicians, popes and bishops, patriarchs and czars. This study attempts to examine one facet of that history, the dispute in the Slovak community of Passaic which divided St. Mary’s Parish and led to the formation of Holy Name Slovak National Catholic Church.

THE SETTING

Located on the Passaic River fifteen miles upstream from Newark, Passaic was first settled by the Dutch in 1678. It remained a small commercial village until after the Civil War when railroads and the textile industry began to change its character. Incorporated as a city in 1873, Passaic welcomed its first Eastern European immigrants six years later. They were brought in by George B. Waterhouse to work in the Waterhouse Brothers Mills. The initial seven immigrants recruited by Waterhouse in 1879 soon turned into a flood from Eastern and Southern Europe. The 1910 census showed Passaic’s foreign born comprising 52% of the total population.⁵ The 1920 census registered a population of 63,824 with 74% of that total being foreign born, the greatest percentage of any city (over 50,000) in the United States.⁶ The Slovak population at the time was estimated to be 7,400.⁷ The WPA Guide to New Jersey describes the area:

East of Main Avenue, a progressively shabbier area stretches down to the river. Here the streets are narrow, with frame swellings and congested tenements crowded beside huge factories. This is the “Dundee Section,” where one-half the population is crammed into one-sixth of the city’s area. Living in this section are most of the foreign-born who comprise about one-third of the total population. Numerically the Poles are first, followed in

turn by the Italians, Russians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Germans, Austrians, Dutch, Scotch, English and Irish.⁸

The initial seven Eastern Europeans whom George Waterhouse brought from Castle Garden to Passaic in December 1879 were all from the Eastern part of Slovakia. They were: Andrew Pastor, John Socha, John Kostisin, and George Slivka from Šariš County; John Pochlod and John Salasovic from Zemplín County; and Edward Geiger from Spiš County.⁹ The initial seven immigrants were quickly joined by their fellow countrymen from Slovakia. When asked what was the inducement to come to America, one of the original seven Slovak immigrants quickly answered "money."¹⁰ Certainly the poor economic conditions in Eastern Europe were a major inducement for European emigration. But Slovaks had another incentive as well. Beginning in the 1870's the government of Hungary, which included Slovakia, embarked on a program of "Magyarization" in the non-Magyar parts of the kingdom. The three Slovak "gymnasia" (high schools) were closed, and most of the religious primary schools were nationalized. The use of Slovak was prohibited in the schools and teachers were awarded a bonus if they were successful Magyarizers.¹¹

Even to study for the priesthood a Slovak must pass through the Magyar seminary, and there any study of the language of the future flock is treated as ground for expulsion.¹²

This process created divisions among Slovaks in America between those who were educated by the Hungarians and those who were not. A dispute broke out in 1902 at St. Stephen's Slovak Parish in Newark between the non-Magyarized parishioners and their pastor, Father Alexander Kovacs. In a solicited letter (Written in Latin), Father Emery ("Imrich" in Slovak, "Imre" in Magyar) Haitinger, Slovak pastor in Passaic, attempted to explain the distinction between the two groups to a confused Bishop John J. O'Connor of Newark.

SLAVICS are a peaceful people, who have built the church and maintain it well: they are the basis of the Slavonic congregation because they pay their debts; SLOVAKS are an ambitious people who desire to lead,

to rule, but they do not like to pay debts, nor will they pay them, as their custom is in the free manner of the Italians . . . These Slovaks are a troublesome people, POLITICAL AGITATORS against the Hungarian fatherland, whose political machinations are not needed in America.¹³

Because of these economic and cultural reasons the number of Slovak immigrants grew rapidly. In 1880 there were 292 foreign-born "Hungarians" in New Jersey. By 1900 that figure grew to 8,404 just in the seven northern counties that comprised the Newark Catholic Diocese.¹⁴

Most of the immigrants to Passaic were Catholic and between 1890 and 1920 the territorial "Irish" parish of St. Nicholas was joined by nine new "national" parishes for Polish, Italian, Slovak, German, Hungarian, Ukrainian and Ruthenian immigrants.¹⁵ The first of the national churches to be organized was St. Michael the Archangel in 1890. This church served Catholics of the Byzantine Rite who were in communion with Rome. Since many of these Ruthenians or "Rusins" lived in the same villages as the Latin Rite Slovaks, the Passaic Slovaks assisted their neighbors in building St. Michael's. This experience may have provided the spark the Slovak community needed for the following year St. Mary's Slovak Parish was organized on April 1.¹⁶ Initially the congregation met in the basement of St. Nicholas' Church, but by 1893 they were able to construct a church of their own on the corner of Monroe and Second Streets. The absence of a stable Slovak clergy in the United States hampered the growth of the new parish. Between 1891 and 1898 the parish was served by a rapid succession of pastors including Fathers Samuel Belja, Bernard Škulik, Benjamin Kwiatkowski, Joseph Ligday, John Pollakovics, and Ignatius Jaskovits, with Father John Sheppard of St. Nicholas often filling in the gaps. On September 2, 1898 Bishop Winand Wigger of Newark appointed Father Emery A. Haitinger, recently arrived in the diocese, as pastor of St. Mary's and he remained for nearly a quarter of a century.¹⁷ Father Haitinger supervised the construction of a new stone church which was completed in 1904. By 1920 the parish numbered between 1200 and 1500 families comprising about 600 individuals.¹⁸

Passaic was not free from strife in those years. Many Passaic workers participated in the "Great Strike of 1913" in which 25,000 mill workers organized by the Industrial Workers of the World struck throughout northern New Jersey.¹⁹ Religious dissension was also not unheard of. In 1910 Sts. Peter and Paul Byzantine Catholic Parish, which had developed from St. Michael's in 1902, defected from the Catholic Church and embraced Russian Orthodoxy. Also in 1918, a rupture in Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Italian parish resulted in the formation of St. Anthony of Padua Independent Italian Catholic Church.²⁰

On March 13, 1921, Bishop O'Connor, at Father Haitinger's request, appointed Father Emery Jeczusko, recently arrived from Europe, to be curate at St. Mary's.²¹ This would seem to have been a routine assignment, but in the highly charged atmosphere of Passaic it was an appointment that would have far-reaching consequences.

THE DISPUTE

Emery A. Haitinger was born in Slovakia, then a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in 1873 just at the time that the government's Magyarization policy was beginning. Haitinger began his seminary training at Arad in the southeastern part of Hungary in what is today Romania, but he emigrated to the United States during his seminary years and completed his training at St. Bonaventure's Seminary in Allegheny, New York. He was ordained a priest by Bishop Michael Hoban at Scranton, Pennsylvania in 1896. For two years Haitinger worked as a missionary among Slovak immigrants in northeastern Pennsylvania. In 1898 Bishop Winand Wigger accepted him for service in the Newark Diocese, and on September 2 of that year the twenty-five year old priest was appointed pastor of St. Mary's Parish in Passaic.²²

Doubtless Haitinger was considered a great asset to a diocese hard pressed to deal with a rapidly growing ethnic group. He was the first stable Slovak priest to work in the diocese, and he was pastorally effective in six languages. He not only supervised the construction of a new church in Passaic, but also was instrumental in the development of new parishes in Boonton, Rockaway, Elizabeth, and Linden. Through his connections in Europe he was

able to bring other Slovak priests to work in the Newark Diocese.

However, Father Haitinger's twenty-four years in Passaic were not entirely peaceful. He considered himself a "gróf" or member of the aristocracy, and sometimes styled himself "von Haitinger," as did his doctor brother.²³ He did nothing to hide his bias for the Magyarized elements of his congregation and his parishioners called him a "Magyarone," a title used for those who supported the Magyarizing of Slovak language and culture.²⁴ There were also more serious charges of moral misconduct and of diverting church funds, particularly for the purchase of property for himself and his family.²⁵

While it is impossible to document these charges, there is a letter from Bishop John Duffy, then Chancellor of the Newark Diocese, to Haitinger on May 20, 1925 indicating some confusion between the personal property of Haitinger and the parish property.

I am writing in reference to the lot owned by you adjoining the school of St. Mary's Parish, Passaic. I am sure that when the lot was purchased by you that you had in mind the future needs of St. Mary's Parish. Conditions there now require that the lot should belong to the church property. I remember hearing that the purchase price at which you bought this piece of property was very small, and I have heard that your present price is extremely large. In the interest of the Church for which you feel as deeply concerned as I do, I would suggest that you fix a price for this property within reason, and let me know what the amount is.²⁶

Haitinger's reply is also interesting.

In my first reply I wrote that I do not possess any lot in Passaic, and I emphasize it again. The pastor of St. Mary's knows it; he rented the lot in 1922 not from me, but from Miss Julia Tereschak, who is the owner since 1907. Before I disposed of the lot, I gave a preference to my congregation; but in a stormy meeting they refused to buy it.²⁷

These controversies about Haitinger's pastorate festered for at least a decade prior to 1922.²⁸

Emery A. Jeczusko was born on February 18, 1888 at Prešov in Slovakia, but he came from Veľký Šariš, the same town that three of the original Slovak immigrants and many of their successors hailed from. Jeczusko attended the seminary at Košice and was ordained there by Bishop Augustine Fischer-Colbrie on November 30, 1911. Bishop Fischer-Colbrie released him to come to America and work among the Slovaks on November 30, 1920,²⁹ and on Father Haitinger's request, Bishop O'Connor of Newark received him and assigned him as curate at St. Mary's, Passaic on March 13, 1921.³⁰

Father Jeczusko was well received in Passaic. He is described as an eloquent orator, who was able to sight translate Latin into Slovak.³¹ He endeared himself to the people not only by his brilliant sermons, but also by his ability to sing High Mass.³² "Anything happen, the people want to see Father Jeczusko . . . and Father Haitinger didn't like that."³³ Father Jeczusko was also socially attached to his parishioners. Unable to speak English, he naturally gravitated to people from his native area. He would often visit the Hungarian Social Club, a few blocks from the rectory, to play cards and have a few beers with his friends.³⁴

On March 11, 1922, Haitinger wrote the following letter to Bishop O'Connor,

Herewith is enclosed my financial statement of 1921. Also in these lines I ask Your Lordship to be so kind as to renew the Faculties of my Assistant, the Rev. Emery Jeczusko, which expires within the coming few days.³⁵

O'Connor replied immediately on March 14.

From what I have learned of Father Jeczusko's habits, I do not wish to renew his faculties in this diocese. Tell him he must seek some other diocese. I enclose a letter testifying that he is not under censure. I will write to Father Miklus and tell him to go to you.³⁶

Meanwhile on April 19, O'Connor received a letter from Bishop Fischer-Colbrie in Kosice.

I received the telegram of Your Excellency, and by your request I recall my priest Emery Jeczusko . . . I also ask that Your Excellency favor me by communicating the causes of your desire, that I may have direction in my agenda with Emery Jeczusko.³⁷

On April 20 O'Connor again communicated with Haitinger.

The enclosed letter for Father Jeczusko is from Bishop Fischer-Colbrie of Cassovia recalling him to his diocese. Oblige me by handing it to him. The Bishop requires him to return at once. It is the result of the cablegram sent sometime ago.³⁸

Bishop O'Connor does not elaborate on the offensive habits of Father Jeczusko, but presumably he did not find it acceptable for priests to fraternize with the laity in social clubs. He also does not elaborate on where he received the information on Father Jeczusko's habits. Popular opinion held that Haitinger himself, and his friends, had informed O'Connor. While there is no conclusive evidence of this, it would appear from O'Connor's second communication to Haitinger that Haitinger was previously aware of the cablegram sent to Europe.

On Sunday, April 23, 1922, Father Jeczusko mounted the pulpit during the 10:30 A.M. Mass and explained his recall and bade the people farewell. He was followed by Father Haitinger who expressed his sorrow at Jeczusko's recall. It appears that this announcement was not a surprise because a demonstration took place outside the church after Mass, and handbills were circulated calling for a mass meeting that night at Hama's Hall in Passaic.³⁹ The hall was filled to capacity, and the meeting was chaired by John J. Labash, an undertaker, and Steven Kollar, a cobbler. Demands were made for Jeczusko's reinstatement and the removal of Haitinger. Even at this early date, the organizers of the dispute were talking about the possibility of a new parish.

Messrs. Labash and Kollar speaking to a *Daily News* man said that the people were going to carry the fight to the bitter end. They felt that they were justified in even organizing an independent parish, if only to carry out what they figured was right.⁴⁰

A second meeting was held on April 27 at Mokrai's Hall in Passaic, and as a result of this meeting ten parish organizations forwarded identical petitions to Bishop O'Connor over the signatures of their officers:

. . . adopted a resolution seeking for the reinstatement of Father Emery Jeczusko in our church of St. Marie's of the Assumption, of Passaic, N.J. and that: The Rev. Emery A. Haitinger, now rector of the church be removed at once for the future good of our parish. This action is based on the wish of more than 600 people who attended a Mass meeting on Sunday, April 23, in a public hall at 108 Third Street, of our city. It is felt that a great deal of harm to our church, Faith and religion has come from the procrastinated action, or deferred action in this regard on your part. More than 90% of the people of our parish have literally refused to further attend the services of our church and we fear that a separation within the parish and a possible establishment of an Independent Church is threatening. It is honestly felt by most of the members of our parish that Father Haitinger must go.⁴¹

The societies claimed a combined membership of 1200.

The arguments against Haitinger centered around three issues: jealousy, finances, and patriotism. Mr. Kollar, a former trustee of the parish, claimed to have proof of serious discrepancies between the amount of money collected in the parish, the amount spent on parish expenses, and the amount in parish accounts.⁴² The patriotism charges were on two different levels. On the one hand Haitinger was accused of "un-Americanism" because he was alleged to have preached in favor of Austria-Hungary during World War I, and also that he had greeted the Hungarian Premier Husar as a Hungarian.⁴³ On the other hand Haitinger was also accused of "Magyarone" tendencies opposed to Slovak culture.⁴⁴ Haitinger's supporters countered by claiming that Haitinger was a true American, while Jeczusko was a retrogressive force in the community.

. . . he was progressive in the matter of organizing a Slavish Federation which carried with it a spirit of the

fatherland and did not conform with the more modern spirit of working for things American.⁴⁵

All through April and May charges and countercharges were exchanged in the local newspapers, meetings were held, petitions were circulated. The atmosphere was further charged by an article in *New Yorkský Denník*, a Slovak newspaper in New York entitled "Battle of Slovak Catholics in Passaic." The article, widely circulated in Passaic, vilified Haitinger, and both the Hungarian and American hierarchy. Describing Haitinger the article commented:

With abuse, cursings, laughter, lies and force more and more the Slovak people were literally chased from God's church merely that he might attain his aim and to make foreign the parish and bring it to the bishop, so to speak, on a silver platter, saying, "Here you have, august dictator, a new Irish parish." This hellish thought of Rev. Haitinger's has found a strong set-back in the face of the Slovak curate. The parson became afraid of his Judas recompense, and the bishop was afraid he would soon lose the Irished parish, which was builded through for Slovak blisters, and so the parson and the bishop got together and in short adjudged the Slovak curate to exile he must go.⁴⁶

The tension was further heightened when one of the dissidents, a Mrs. Theresa Sisko, went to the rectory after Mass on Sunday, May 7 to reclaim at last a portion of a previous donation of \$4,000. Haitinger told her she would have to sue the parish, told her to get out, and then forcibly evicted her from the rectory, causing her to fall down the stairs and sustain many bruises.⁴⁷ Within a few days Mrs. Sisko brought suit against Haitinger for \$30,000.

The reports of the Sisko incident circulating through the city brought out a record crowd of 2,000 to a meeting that same night at Mokrai's Hall. During the meeting Labash and Kollar reiterated the history of their grievances. They claimed that petitions to the bishop in previous years had been destroyed before reaching him, that a committee sent to the bishop and the Apostolic Delegate in 1919 had failed to get a hearing, and that each time Bishop

O'Connor was approached "he always sent us away with a promise to consider the matter."⁴⁸ They then told the assembly of the bishop's final decision not allow Jenczusko to remain in the diocese. The allegations of financial mismanagement were repeated, and Mrs. Frank Matisovsky produced laughter among the audience when she related incidents of Haitinger's improprieties and her lack of satisfaction when these were related to the bishop.⁴⁹ The assembly was unanimous in its determination to replace Haitinger with another priest, have Jeczusko reinstated, and if necessary, form a new parish and even secede from the Catholic Church. For the first time the finances of a new church were discussed, and the name "Holy Name Parish" was used.⁵⁰

On Saturday the committee went to South Orange to approach Bishop O'Connor. This time they took Mrs. Sisko with them and she spoke to the bishop's secretary. Also during the week the committee met with Msgr. John A. Sheppard of Jersey City, formerly pastor of St. Nicholas, Passaic, and later Vicar General of the diocese. Acting on Sheppard's advice the committee formally presented a request to Haitinger to resign the pastorate with a copy of the request sent to O'Connor.⁵¹

Rumors of Haitinger's removal were rampant in the city when he did not appear at Masses on Sunday, May 21. Instead the Masses were celebrated by Father John Salamon, a native son of the parish, and curate at St. Joseph's Parish in Elizabeth. It was reported that Haitinger had celebrated Mass in Elizabeth and returned to Passaic in the afternoon. The Saturday edition of the *Passaic Daily News* for May 27 carried the following article:

As forecast by *The Daily News* Monday evening, the Rev. Father John D. Salamon, rector of St. Joseph's Church in Elizabeth, and formerly a pupil at St. Marie's Parochial School, of this city, has been designated as the new rector for the local Slovak Catholic Church, thus ending the controversy which threatened for a time to disrupt the entire St. Marie's Parish. Announcement was made by the Right Rev. Monsignor John A. Duffy, chancellor of the Catholic diocese of Newark, Thursday evening, to the effect that the Right Rev. Bishop John

J. O'Connor had decided upon the change being made. Meanwhile the Rev. Father Emery A. Haitinger, rector of St. Marie's Church since 1898, will be unattached for a while. He will visit temporarily with the Rev. Father Andrew Adzima, his former curate, and now rector of St. Joseph's in Bayonne.⁵²

However the happy conclusion to the controversy forecast by the *Passaic Daily News* was premature. Having accomplished the first of their goals, the committee pressed on to insist on the reinstatement of Father Jeczusko as curate. The dissidents crystallized around Labash, Kollar, Marcel Sherman, a painter, Victor Chirip, a former locksmith in the Austrian royal palace, and Paul Skvarla, an architect.⁵³ The committee continued to treat with O'Connor about Jeczusko throughout the summer, but O'Connor was adamant. Jeczusko himself meanwhile did not participate in the controversy, but stayed with his brother in Connecticut. He did not reappear in Passaic until the middle of August.⁵⁴

The committee enlisted the help of Father Salamon to intervene with the bishop on Jeczusko's behalf, but this was to no avail. During the first week of August the committee met with O'Connor in Newark and was once again told that Jeczusko would not be reinstated. The mood of the committee can be summed up in the comment of Marcel Sherman, "We're not going to have that Irish bishop telling us what to do."⁵⁵ At a mass meeting on Monday, August 6, the committee reported the bishop's refusal to the parishioners and the break with St. Mary's was made final. Labash and Kollar were elected chairman and vice chairman respectively of the new parish. Pledges were received for \$14,000 and \$550 was collected that first night. Still, Labash held out the possibility of reconciliation:

The new church, it was explained, would not necessarily become detached from the Roman Catholic Church in this country, provided, of course, Bishop O'Connor accepted their action as being a logical expression of the feelings of a people who were hurt, and agreed to treat them on a par with the other congregations within his

diocese, but with the understanding that Father Jeczusko would be rector of the church and the mode of carrying on the business affairs of the parish put in the hands of the parishioners rather than the clergymen.⁵⁶

At a mass meeting on Saturday, August 20 at Hama's Hall with Father Jeczusko present, the priest was formally offered the post of pastor of Holy Name Slovak Church. Jeczusko's reply is indicative of his personal turmoil in this situation:

"I am facing a difficult situation, my friends," he stated, "having my passpost all ready, I have merely to engage passage to leave for my home country. Your apparent sincerity of purpose, however, and your zeal in the endeavor to carry out the true significance of Catholicism, prompt me to heed your call." He then asked that the people not try to set aside the Roman Catholic authority. He intimated that serious things might happen to him. "And after all," he exclaimed, "our work is in the name of God above, the name of our newly formed parish implies that, and with His aid we shall conquer all things. By the memory of my sweet little mother, whose greatest ambition in life was to see me at the Altar of the Almighty, serving with honor, serving with a dignified fear of Him above, and fulfilling all that is prescribed by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, I accept this call to serve you, my people. But I implore you not to give up your traditions, the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church. Let us call unto ourselves the leadership of this great church with its authority."⁵⁷

Father Jeczusko celebrated the first Mass for the new parish on Sunday, August 27, 1922 at Hama's Hall where many of the organizational meetings had been held.⁵⁸ On August 29 Bishop O'Connor wrote to Father Salamon explaining Father Jeczusko's excommunicated status and the fact that the new congregation was not a Catholic church.⁵⁹ He asked that this letter be read at all Masses the following Sunday, September 2.

Approximately one third of the parishioners of St. Mary's

joined Holy Name Parish. In his 1922 report to the diocese, Haitinger listed 1260 men, 1810 women, and 2600 children at St. Mary's for a total of 5760. This report was signed by trustees Michael Novak and Steven Kollar, both of whom would later join Holy Name Parish. The 1924 report submitted by Father Salamon showed a drop in all three categories, for a total decrease of 1323 people. However these figures are approximations. The 1922 Sunday and Holyday Collections amounted to \$9,794.67, while the same collections in the 1926 report amounted to \$6,621.22⁶⁰ Perhaps the best gauge for the extent of the split are the baptismal and marriage records for both churches.⁶¹

BAPTISMS

	St. Mary's	Holy Name
1920	108	
1921	149	
1922	160	21
1923	105	58
1924	111	34
1925	104	55
1926	99	36

MARRIAGES

	St. Mary's	Holy Name
1920	36	
1921	40	
1922	31	2
1923	40	15
1924	45	25
1925	37	12
1926	34	19

If St. Mary's listed between 1200 and 1500 families in its 1922 report, Holy Name in its 1937 report to the parish listed 517 contributing families.⁶² From all these sources the figure of one third of the Slovak community of Passaic belonging to Holy Name Parish seems reliable.

The parishioners set about the task of securing property on Fourth Street, five blocks away from St. Mary's and contracted for the erection of a new church and rectory costing \$100,000.

Father Jeczusko, meanwhile, stayed at the home of Andrew Singlary on Fourth Street. In the Spring of 1925 the cornerstone was ready to be blessed. On May 5, 1925 Steven Kollar wrote to Bishop O'Connor on behalf of the parish committee to request a meeting with the bishop.⁶³ The chancellor of the Newark Diocese, Msgr. John A. Duffy, responded to the letter and the meeting was held on May 11. This appears to be the one time that Father Jeczusko was present for a meeting of this type.⁶⁴ The committee asked that Bishop O'Connor come to bless the cornerstone of the new church. Monsignor Duffy agreed to present the proposal to O'Connor. In the meantime Duffy requested Father Salamon to send a letter to Bishop Fischer-Colbrie in Slovakia asking him to send Jeczusko a specific "mandatum" to return to Slovakia.⁶⁵ On May 20, 1925, Monsignor Duffy responded to Kollar in the name of Bishop O'Connor. In very blunt terms Duffy informed Kollar that the church would have to be turned directly over to the bishop, who would then have it incorporated under New Jersey law with himself as the president, the pastor as secretary-treasurer, and with two lay trustees appointed by the bishop. The pastor would administer the parish and its temporalities. With regard to Father Jeczusko, he would have to submit to Canon Law, reject his schism, and his future status would have to be decided by Rome. Nothing could be promised for him. Duffy concluded, "It will be impossible therefore, for us to negotiate with you any further except on the terms laid down above,"⁶⁶ and exhorted them to abandon their schism.

On May 30, 1925 the cornerstone of Holy Name Church was solemnly blessed by the Right Rev. Monsignor Louis Rusko of Philadelphia,⁶⁷ in the presence of many clergymen of the area. The newspapers reported the fact that the parish committee had "waited on the Rt. Rev. Bishop John O'Connor of the Catholic Diocese of Newark in an effort to have him send a representative to take part in the ceremonies."⁶⁸ No Catholic representative was present at the ceremonies, and that marked the effective end of the relationship between Holy Name Slovak Church and the Roman Catholic Church. On November 27, 1925, the Right Rev. Bishop Francis Hodur of Scranton, Pennsylvania, founder of the Polish National Catholic Church, solemnly blessed Holy Name

Church.⁶⁹ From that time on Holy Name Parish held its ecclesial communion with the Polish National Catholic Church.

THE AFTERMATH

In 1926, now nearing the end of his lengthy episcopate, O'Connor responded to an inquiry about Holy Name Church from the Apostolic Delegate, Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi:

Through one of the Slovak priests I have requested Father Jeczusko's bishop, who will be here for the Eucharistic Congress, to visit Passaic and see his subject personally. I hope that as a result of this visit Father Jeczusko will return to his diocese and that the financial difficulties of the Holy Name Parish will force the remaining members to turn the property over to legitimate authority. I beg to assure Your Excellency that this matter is settling itself and within a short time the so called Independent Church will be but a name.⁷⁰

Whether the visit from the Bishop of Košice took place is unknown. However, the situation did not settle itself. A year later the chancellor of the Newark Diocese wrote to Father Jeczusko on behalf of Bishop O'Connor to correct a statement that Jeczusko had made in a court case alleging that he was not an excommunicated priest.⁷¹

In the ensuing years a number of inquiries and attempts at reconciliation were initiated, primarily by Slovak priests, but nothing came of them. In the summer of 1938 Father Jeczusko died, just a matter of weeks after the installation of the Most Rev. Thomas H. McLaughlin as first Bishop of Paterson, a new diocese cut off from Newark and including the city of Passaic. A committee including Marcel Sherman, John Tomecko, George Nemec and John Rusnak approached Bishop McLaughlin concerning a reconciliation. McLaughlin was hopeful and asked the Apostolic Delegate for instructions in handling the matter.⁷² However, nothing came of the discussion principally because of the diocesan requirement to have the church incorporated with the bishop as president. The trustees were unwilling to turn over the property to the bishop, even a new friendly bishop.⁷³ The committee engaged as their new pastor the Reverend Eugene Magyar, a native

of Palmerton, Pennsylvania, and a Slovak despite his name, who had been assisting Father Jeczusko.

In 1945 a new pastor, Andrew J. Romanak, was named for St. Mary's Parish after Father Salamon's death. Through his offices another attempt at reconciliation was made late in 1946 just a few months before Bishop McLaughlin's death. McLaughlin received instructions and assurances from the Apostolic Delegate concerning proceeding in the various questions concerning reconciliation, and McLaughlin addressed a letter to the congregation through its president Stephen Matthias in January, 1947.⁷⁴ However, again nothing came of the attempt.⁷⁵

In 1963 Father Magyar was ordained by the Polish National Catholic Church as a bishop for the Slovak National Catholics. At this time Holy Name acquired the title "cathedral," although it is not the see church of a specific diocese. Bishop Magyar died in 1968 and was briefly succeeded by a priest of the Polish National Catholic Church, Father John Hrencewicz. After Father Hrencewicz's departure, Father William Chromey, a Polish National Catholic priest of Slovak descent, who had served previously as an associate to Bishop Magyar, came to Holy Name and remains pastor there to this day.

From the beginning there have been defections from Holy Name back to St. Mary's. Many of these occurred on an individual basis over the years. As it became apparent that the split was going to be a permanent one, the people faced various hardships. The split cut across family lines, and no longer considered "Catholic," members of Holy Name were denied burial in St. Mary's Cemetery where their parents and other relatives were buried. No longer considered "Catholic," the Holy Name parishioners were dropped from membership in the First Catholic Slovak Union and subsequently lost its benefits.⁷⁶ Sometimes the occasion of a marriage to a Roman Catholic provided the opportunity to return to that faith. After the ever-popular Father Jeczusko's death in 1938, still more members of the congregation returned to St. Mary's. The financial obligations incurred by the congregation too, were a factor in inducing some members to leave.⁷⁷ Eventually both John Labash and Steven Kollar, as well

as a number of the other early organizers, returned to St. Mary's and the Roman Catholic Church.⁷⁸

However, a sizeable number of families remained faithful to the parish. The ideals for which the congregation had fought: independence from hierarchical control, and lay control of parish affairs; remained an attractive reality to many of the people. Today Holy Name Parish continues to be supported by some 250 families.⁷⁹

The parish that Father Jeczusko shepherded remained, as he promised in his acceptance speech, faithful to its Catholic traditions. While embracing Polish National Catholicism in an organizational sense, the parish never severed its ties with Roman Catholic usages. While the Polish National Church introduced the vernacular at an early date, both Father Jeczusko and Bishop Magyar continued to use Latin until a few months before the Roman Catholic church changed to the vernacular.⁸⁰ The liturgical books of the Roman Church were used and Father Jeczusko continued to pray his Divine Office in the church each day.⁸¹ At Mass he prayed for the pope and the bishop of Newark, and on Good Friday he joined the rest of the Roman Catholic Church in its solemn orations "for schismatics and heretics," even if the rest of the Church felt it was praying for him.⁸² The *Baltimore Catechism* continued to be in use throughout Father Jeczusko's pastorate.⁸³ The people were adamant in their desire for a celibate clergy in the manner of the Roman Church, even though the Polish National Church has had a married clergy for years. Part of the impetus for the 1947 reconciliation attempt was the suspicion among many parishioners that Father Magyar was married.⁸⁴

Father Jeczusko himself seems to have become something of a pathetic figure toward the end of his life. As it became apparent that the split was permanent, he seemed to some to become more despondent. Although happy with his situation among his beloved people, he was not content with his situation in the wider Church. "I know I didn't do right. I'll pay for it somewhere," he commented to a friend.⁸⁵ Unable to speak English even at the end of his life, Jeczusko was in some ways a hostage of his congregation, dependent on them for his dealings with the wider world, including medical attention. He died in the summer of 1938, not

yet fifty-one years old, perhaps of a heart attack brought on by emphysema.⁸⁶ Perhaps his real state of mind is best revealed by his will, which, after a few bequests to close friends, left his entire estate to the seminary at Košice.⁸⁷

After leaving Passaic Emery Haitinger was named pastor of the much smaller parish of St. Joseph in Elizabeth. He remained there for the rest of his life, dying on November 14, 1959 at the age of eighty-six.⁸⁸ There is no documentary evidence that any responsibility was ever attached to him for the debacle in Passaic in 1922, except for the Duffy letter and one other incident that occurred much later in his life. On April 10, 1946, Pope Pius XII honored Haitinger by making him a monsignor at the request of his seminary classmate, Thomas J. Walsh, who was now the Archbishop of Newark. This occurred on the fiftieth anniversary of Haitinger's ordination. For the senior Slovak pastor in an ethnically conscious diocese, who had built two churches and actively participated in the formation of at least four congregations, this was an unusually long time to wait for that honor.

CONCLUSION

Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin, the first Bishop of Paterson perhaps best summed up the situation that led to Holy Name Slovak National Catholic Church in several observations made over the years:

Investigations which were made by me . . . have led me to the conclusion that the differences existing among the Slovak people of Passaic and Clifton have been and were due to misunderstandings . . . ⁸⁹

I often felt, even before becoming Bishop of Paterson, that this man (Father Jeczusko) unfamiliar with the English language and American customs was to some extent the unwitting victim of a situation that got out of control.⁹⁰

I have always felt that the congregation as a whole was not completely at fault, and that good Father Jeczusko, not being familiar with American legal conditions and canonical procedure, erred somewhat through misunderstanding rather than through malice.⁹¹

At the time of the 1922 conflict McLaughlin was president of Seton Hall College and rector of the Newark-diocesan theologate, and therefore not totally removed from the situation. That he should maintain such an opinion puts him in stark contrast to Bishop O'Connor.

Another observer commented from a different viewpoint: "The trustees were feeling their oats. If the bishop had cooperated it could have been different. But he always felt 'I'm the boss.' " ⁹²

Certainly Bishop McLaughlin's observations of Father Jeczusko seem accurate. He was more a catalyst for the revolt, rather than a cause for it. The dissatisfaction in St. Mary's had been festering for years. At the same time the Slovak community in Passaic was becoming more and more successful and less willing to be treated with the Old World domination of Father Haitinger or the paternalism of Bishop O'Connor. In this sense Father Jeczusko's popularity was more a lightning rod for the fire to strike.

Mr. Labash's comments on Bishop O'Connor also seem accurate. He certainly was an unwavering figure in the controversy, preferring to back up established authority (Haitinger) even when his position was untenable, and even then refusing to compromise on any point. It must be remembered that the dissidents never asked for Jeczusko to replace Haitinger, but merely to be able to remain at St. Mary's. Certainly by 1922 there was enough evidence from situations around the country over the years that Slovak and other eastern European congregations were capable of carrying disputes to the point of schism.⁹³ Perhaps his successful handling of a similar situation among the Italians earlier in his administration made O'Connor feel that this situation could be similarly handled from a position of strength.⁹⁴

Bishop O'Connor was also something of a distant figure in this dispute, preferring to deal through Salamon and Duffy. Indeed there is no evidence that O'Connor and Jeczusko ever met face to face through the whole five years they were both involved in the controversy.

Whatever O'Connor's reasons for his handling of the affair, his methods were unsuccessful and things did not "settle down." Holy Name Church still stands today within what was once the Newark Diocese of Bishop O'Connor, one of the only two surviv-

ing Slovak National Catholic Churches in the United States, an unusual monument to the unwavering determination of many people.

NOTES

- ¹ Holy Trinity Slovak Lutheran Church, a short distance across the river in Garfield, N.J. could easily be a fifth partner in this description.
- ² Mark Stolarik, "Lay Initiative in American-Slovak Parishes: 1880-1930," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, 83 (1972) p. 158.
- ³ See *Tenth Anniversary of the Holy Name Slovak Catholic Church* (1932), *Diamond Jubilee Journal, St. Mary's Church* (1968), and *Slovaks in America* (Middletown, Pa.: Slovak League of America, 1978.)
- ⁴ There is a Sts. Cyril and Methodius Slovak National Catholic Church in Perth Amboy, N.J. but the two congregations are not directly connected, nor has Holy Name ever been connected with the Czechoslovak National Church which developed in Europe.
- ⁵ Rudolph J. Vecoli, *The People of New Jersey* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1965), p. 213.
- ⁶ William W. Scott, *Passaic and Its Environs* (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1922), p. 496.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 496.
- ⁸ Works Progress Administration, *New Jersey: A Guide to its Present and Past* (New York: Hastings House, 1946), pp. 345-346.
- ⁹ Scott, *Op. cit.*, p. 494.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ M. Mark Stolarik, "Immigration, Education and the Social Mobility of Slovaks, 1870-1930," in *Immigrants and Religion in Urban America*, Randall M. Miller and Thomas D. Marzik, eds. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977) pp. 105-106.
- ¹² Emily Greene Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910), p. 111.
- ¹³ Rev. Emery Haitinger to Bishop John O'Connor, Feast of St. Emery, 1902, Archives of the Archdiocese of Newark (hereafter AAN), Haitinger Personnel File. Accused of being a "Magyarone" himself, Haitinger in this letter sets down his own biases two decades before the similar controversy which would engulf him.
- ¹⁴ New Jersey Catholic Historical Records Commission, *The Bishops of Newark 1853-1978* (South Orange, N.J.: Seton Hall University Press, 1978), p. 64.
- ¹⁵ In 1954 an eleventh parish would be added in Passaic with the establishment of Our Lady of Fatima Church for the new wave of Hispanic immigrants.
- ¹⁶ The parish is variously referred to as St. Mary's, St. Marie's (an affectation that seems to have developed after the construction of the "French Gothic" new church), and Assumption. The incorporated name of the parish is "Slavonian Catholic Church of the Assumption."

- ¹⁷ *Elizabeth Daily Journal*, November 14, 1959, AAN, Haitinger Personnel File.
- ¹⁸ AAN, Parish Reports, 1922.
- ¹⁹ Vecoli, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
- ²⁰ Archives of the Diocese of Paterson (hereafter ADP), St. Anthony's, Passaic file. This schism was resolved in 1924.
- ²¹ ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church file.
- ²² For background information on Haitinger see AAN, Haitinger Personnel File.
- ²³ Interview with Albin Stolarik, November 23, 1983, ADP.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ Interview with John Labash, October 31, 1983, ADP.
- ²⁶ AAN, John A. Duffy to Emery A. Haitinger May 20, 1925, Haitinger Personnel File.
- ²⁷ Emery Haitinger to John Duffy, 1925, AAN. Miss Julia Tereschak was Haitinger's housekeeper.
- ²⁸ *Passaic Daily News*, August 7, 1922. p. 1.
- ²⁹ Testimonial of Bishop Augustine Fischer-Colbrie, November 30, 1920, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ³⁰ Personnel Record, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ³¹ Albin Stolarik, *Op. cit.*
- ³² Labash, *Op. cit.*
- ³³ Interview with Stephen Matthias, November 7, 1983, ADP.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, and Labash, *Op. cit.*
- ³⁵ John O'Connor to Emery Haitinger, March 14, 1922, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ³⁷ Augustine Fischer-Colbrie to John O'Connor, April 1, 1922, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ³⁸ John O'Connor to Emery Haitinger, April 20, 1922, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ³⁹ *Passaic Daily News*, April 24, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴⁰ *Passaic Daily News*, April 24, 1922, p. 2.
- ⁴¹ Petition of Branch 192 of the First Catholic Slovak Union, and Branch 2 of the Slovak Union of Passaic, N.J., April 29, 1922, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.
- ⁴² *Passaic Daily Herald*, April 24, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴³ *Passaic Daily News*, April 28, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴⁴ *Passaic Daily News*, April 29, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴⁵ *Passaic Daily News*, April 24, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴⁶ *Passaic Daily News*, May 1, 1922, p. 2.
- ⁴⁷ *Passaic Daily News*, May 8, 1922, p. 1.
- ⁴⁸ *Passaic Daily Herald*, May 8, 1922, pp. 1-2.
- ⁴⁹ *Passaic Daily Herald*, May 8, 1922, pp. 1-2. Mrs. Matisovsky related that Haitinger had offered her money to accompany him to Coney Island.
- ⁵⁰ One of the complaints against Haitinger was his inattention to the needs of the

parishioners, particularly his refusal to allow the formation of a Holy Name Society for the men of the parish.

⁵¹ *Passaic Daily News*, May 25, 1922, p. 1.

⁵² *Passaic Daily News*, May 27, 1922, p. 1.

⁵³ Both Kollar's son and Skvarla's nephew would eventually become Roman Catholic priests.

⁵⁴ *Passaic Daily News*, August 15, 1922, pp. 1-2.

⁵⁵ Albin Stolarik, *Op. cit.*

⁵⁶ *Passaic Daily News*, August 7, 1922, p. 1.

⁵⁷ *Passaic Daily News*, August 21, 1922, pp. 1, 3.

⁵⁸ The fact that Hama's Hall was attached to a tavern was constantly brought up by the opposition as an indication of the dissidents' lack of religiosity.

⁵⁹ John O'Connor to John Salamon, August 29, 1922, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁶⁰ AAN, Parish Reports, 1922, 1924, 1926.

⁶¹ Father Haitinger kept poor sacramental records, with baptisms and marriages being recorded in batches, and some years later.

⁶² Financial Report of the Holy Name Slovak Catholic Church of Passaic, N.J. for the year 1937, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁶³ Steven Kollar to John O'Connor, May 5, 1925, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁶⁴ Duffy and Jeczusko were unable to communicate directly, since Jeczusko could not speak English, and Dufy was unable to communicate in Latin when Jeczusko tried that language. Matthias, *Op. cit.*

⁶⁵ John Salamon to Augustine Fischer-Colbrie, May 14, 1925, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File. Salamon was unaware that Fischer-Colbrie had already died.

⁶⁶ John Duffy to Steven Kollar, May 20, 1925, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁶⁷ There is some confusion about Msgr. Rusko's status. He is described as a Roman Catholic and "Apostolic Visitor" for Slovaks in America. However his name does not appear in any Catholic Directories in the 1920's. Another source said he was actually an Anglican. See Albin Stolarik, *Op. cit.*

⁶⁸ *Passaic Daily News*, May 29, 1925, p. 1.

⁶⁹ *Passaic Daily News*, November 27, 1925, p. 1. This was not Bishop Hodur's first visit to Passaic. He had previously presided at the cornerstone blessing and Confirmation for St. Anthony of Padua Independent Italian Catholic Church on May 11, 1919.

⁷⁰ John O'Connor to Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi, June 16, 1926, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁷¹ John Duffy to Emery Jeczusko, March 11, 1927, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁷² Thomas McLaughlin to Amleto Cicognani, August 11, 1938, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁷³ Labash, *Op. cit.*

⁷⁴ Thomas McLaughlin to Stephen Matthias *et al.*, January 16, 1947, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁷⁵ This time the difficulty centered around the fate of Father Magyar. The trustees real-

ized that he would have to leave if reconciliation was accomplished, but they did not wish to simply "abandon" Magyar. They felt that it was necessary to find some work or provide some financial settlement for him. Bishop McLaughlin balked at this, and before the matter could be settled, McLaughlin died on March 17, 1947. Labash, *Op. cit.*

⁷⁶ John Salamon to Augustine Fischer-Colbrie, May 14, 1925, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File. See also M. Mark Stolarik, "Building Slovak Communities in America" in Keith P. Dyrud, *et al. The Other Catholics* (New York: Arno Press, 1978), p. 106.

⁷⁷ Matthias, *Op. cit.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Interview with William Chromey, October 14, 1983, ADP.

⁸⁰ Matthias, *Op. cit.*

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Albin Stolarik, *Op. cit.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ Andrew Romanak to Thomas McLaughlin, July 23, 1946, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File. It was not until Magyar's will was probated in 1968 that the congregation at large finally learned that he was indeed married to his housekeeper, Isabelle.

⁸⁵ Labash, *Op. cit.*

⁸⁶ Matthias, *Op. cit.*

⁸⁷ Thomas McLaughlin to Amleto Cicognani, December 13, 1946, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁸⁸ AAN, Haitinger Personnel File.

⁸⁹ Thomas McLaughlin to Stephen Matthias et al., January 16, 1947, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁹⁰ Thomas McLaughlin to Amleto Cicognani, December 13, 1946, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁹¹ Thomas McLaughlin to Andrew Romanak, May 28, 1946, ADP, Holy Name Slovak Church File.

⁹² Labash, *Op. cit.*

⁹³ M. Mark Stolarik, "Lay Initiative . . ." *Op. cit.*

⁹⁴ ADP, St. Anthony, Passaic, Parish File.

REVIEWS

Vojtech Kopčan. *Turecké nebezpečenstvo a Slovensko*. Bratislava: Veda, 1986. 217 pp.

R. VLADIMIR BAUMGARTEN
Tallahassee, Florida

This beautifully illustrated work presents an overview of Slovakia's position in the wars between the Turkish Ottomans and the Austrian Habsburgs. For purposes of convenience the author divides this historic conflict into several periods. The first period began with the Ottoman advance through the Balkans in the fifteenth century and climaxed with the historic battle of Mohač in 1526. The battle effectively broke the power of the old Hungarian kingdom, and marked the first attempt of the Habsburgs to gain the crown of Saint Stephen. Habsburg efforts were temporarily thwarted by Hungary's last national king János Zapolya (whose name is Slovakized by the author to Zápolsky), but the kingdom was partitioned by Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent in 1541. At this point the Habsburgs gained western and northern Hungary, and the Slovak counties became a definite buffer against further Ottoman advance.

Slovakia was only indirectly influenced by the Turkish wars in the first-mentioned phase, although Kopčan points to this period as a time when many Croats migrated to the Slovak counties. But the period between the partition of 1541 and the peace treaty of Edirne of 1568 entailed dramatic changes: an additional noble exodus from Turkish-occupied Hungary strengthened feudalism in the Slovak lands, and the Turks made increasing inroads into the mountain districts. The resumption of hostilities in the following two decades saw the rise of pro-Habsburg magnates — particularly the Pálffy and Forgách families — who later played key roles in the history of Habsburg Hungary.

By the early seventeenth century Transylvania was likewise making an impact on Upper Hungary. The principality's Protestant rulers, paying nominal allegiance to the Ottoman Porte, frequently sought and gained the support of the latter in their struggles against the Habsburgs. The Transylvanian forays brought great devastation to Slovakia, and also saw the transfer of Košice and

the eastern Slovak counties to Transylvania's jurisdiction by the Treaty of Linz in 1645. An attempt by Transylvanian elements to shift to the Habsburg orbit in 1663 led directly to the high-tide mark of Turkish advance into Slovakia; the subsequent peace left the southern counties under direct Ottoman control.

Habsburg misrule, the greed of Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa, and the ambitions of Transylvanian leader Imre Thököly are all cited as factors in the campaign culminating in the great siege of Vienna in 1683. Most knowledgeable historians credit the great naval battle of Lepanto in 1571 as the real turning point of Ottoman fortunes, and Kopčan himself alludes to the significance of the event at the beginning of Chapter Four. But for Central Europe, including Slovakia, the breaking of the siege of Vienna was indeed a turning point. The intervention of Poland was decisive in driving the Turks from southern Slovakia and marked the retreat of Transylvanian power in the eastern counties. In keeping with official Czechoslovak historiography, Kopčan treats the liberation of Nové Zámky as a positive event, and, indeed, the book was written to mark the three hundredth anniversary. The results can scarcely be termed "socially progressive:" feudalism was not weakened, Habsburg absolutism was actually strengthened, and the cause of religious toleration received a severe setback. Kopčan's line of reasoning may be found in Chapter Nine, which serves as a kind of "balance sheet" of the Ottoman presence. The occupied territories were viewed primarily as military frontier zones, and the heavy demands imposed upon the government reflected the same purpose. At least the Mohammedan invaders were replaced by rulers less foreign to the Slovaks, and the war shifted considerably further to the south.

A number of the weaknesses of the book are scarcely those of the author's making. The complex course of events creates difficulties in distinguishing between one period and the next. The Slovak lands are treated as mere pawns in the struggle between the contesting powers — and this was indeed the case. But although Kopčan occasionally cites the roles of individual Slovak personalities, he might have given the counties greater attention. In large measure this weakness stems from his choice of source materials. Notes are applied liberally at the end of each chapter,

and the sources consulted boast of fine studies emanating from numerous countries. But Kopčan might easily have relied more on contemporary Slovak county records. An examination of the Imperial War Archives in Vienna might also have yielded something genuinely original.

For advanced students of Slovak history, the Habsburgs, and the Ottoman Empire alike, *Turecké nebezpečenstvo* presents no great revelations. But Kopčan masterfully ties together several interrelated themes, and the main topic has thus far received little attention in the West. The book may therefore serve as a springboard to more intensive studies of Slovakia's position during the Turkish wars.

Matej Bel: doba-život-dielo. Edited by Ján Tibenský. Bratislava: Veda, 1987. 414 pp.

Pamätnica z osláv dvojstého výročia Jána Hollého. Edited by Juraj Chovan. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1985. 472 pp.

GERALD J. SABO
John Carroll University
University Heights, Ohio

Matej Bel is a collection of scholarly papers presented at a conference on Bel (1684-1749) in December, 1983. The Historical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and the Slovak Society for the History of Science and Technology co-sponsored the conference, which was planned in honor of the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Matej Bel, an event highlighted in the UNESCO calendar for 1984.

Bel was a prominent and talented Slovak scholar in many areas, as well as a Lutheran minister and promoter of Pietism. His role in Slovak and Magyar/Hungarian cultural history is well known in Central European scholarly circles. Regrettably, Bel is virtually unknown outside of them. The format of this volume continues to insure his inaccessibility to a wider scholarly or general audience. Indeed, this volume contrasts sharply and somewhat unfavorably with the memorial book on the Bernolák-Slovak poet Ján Hollý.

The book on Hollý was published under the auspices of the Matica slovenská in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of Hollý's birth as noted by UNESCO in its 1985 calendar. Ján Hollý (1785-1849) was a Roman Catholic priest and *the* outstanding poet of what is known as Bernolák-Slovak. This version of literary Slovak was codified by Anton Bernolák, another Catholic priest, in the late 1780's and early 1790's. Employing this codification, which became the writing form of Catholic Slovaks until sometime in the 1850's, Hollý first translated classical poets and later created his own poetry in it. This book includes a chronology of Hollý's life and works, written accounts of various celebrations in his honor, scholarly papers from a conference about him, and varia. It is a fitting tribute to a writer long neglected in contemporary Slovakia and but very recently properly heralded.

The Hollý memorial has some rather distinctive features. The Slovak text is usually followed by English and French summaries of varying length, with shorter Russian and German summaries of everything at the end of the volume. Such linguistic variety makes this book accessible to a very wide audience; this is not a typical Slovak publishing practice. By contrast, the Bel volume is completely in Slovak, with no summaries in any other language. Furthermore, the Hollý memorial has sixteen color photographs while the reproductions in the Bel volume are all in black and white. Both books have colored dust jackets, but the Hollý book, unlike the Bel volume, has reproduced on the inside cover, front and back, some well-known historic scenes. One is of Bernolák presenting his codification to the Trnava primate and to the Catholic seminarians in Bratislava; the other has the Lutheran pastor and scholar Ľudovít Štúr and his followers presenting their codification ideas to Hollý. Such elaborate binding was not really necessary but it indicates the degree to which contemporary Slovak cultured society wished to honor Hollý. The books were also published in disproportionate numbers: 7,500 Hollý books versus only 800 on Bel. Unlike the Bel volume, the Hollý book includes indices that enhance its scholarly value. The final contrast is even more striking. The Hollý conference was held in 1985

and the memorial book appeared in the *same year*! The Bel conference took place in 1983 and the papers were not published until 1987.

In spite of the publisher's slights, the Bel volume is excellent, as one might expect from its editor, the distinguished historian Ján Tibenský. This collection of papers is divided into six main topic areas among which are distributed forty-four presentations of varying size. The topic areas are: the era, life, and world view of Matej Bel; Bel as a pedagogue; the great country-wide project of Matej Bel and his attempts at organizing the scholarly life of the Hungarian state; the *Notitia* and *Adparatus* as realizations of Matej Bel's country-wide program; the peoples of the old Hungarian state in his writings; and his final message and bequest. In addition to some introductory comments, Ján Tibenský contributed five of the articles; the remaining 39 are primarily by Slovak specialists from many fields. For some strange reason the authors are noted on the bottom of the first page of their articles, and not in the Table of Contents.

There is also a laudable wealth of material in the Hollý memorial book. One section contains 23 scholarly papers from the conference on Hollý, plus introductory and concluding comments by Karol Rosenbaum. Of greatest interest to me in literature and cultural history were the following: Ján Tibenský's paper on the great Moravian and Cyrillomethodian tradition in the writings of Ján Hollý; Zdenka Sojková's discussion of Hollý's reception and influence in the Czech lands; Viliam Turčány's consideration of Hollý's poetic language; as well as that of František Štraus, and Katarina Habovštiaková's discussion of Hollý and Bernolák-Slovak. The appendices — a select bibliography, a listing of Hollý's manuscripts, a name and place index — will be helpful to interested readers.

The scholar fortunate enough to obtain copies of both books, especially the smaller Bel volume, will possess an abundance of material on Slovak cultural history of the 18th and 19th, and even of the 20th centuries. Such high-quality books are not often found in Slovak studies. Their respective editors and contributors are to be commended for making two prominent cultural figures more accessible to the Slavic scholarly community.

Hugolín Gavlovič (1712-1787). Introduction by Michal Eliáš.
Martin: Matica slovenská, 1987. 17 photographs, 11 pp.

GERALD J. SABO
John Carroll University
University Heights, Ohio

This *fotosúbor* was published in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the death of Hugolín Gavlovič, a Franciscan priest who was a major Slovak writer of the eighteenth century. Michal Eliáš' introduction is written in a popular, somewhat scholarly style in order to make his comments accessible to a wide-ranging reading public. Highlighted is Gavlovič's *Valaská Škola*, an extensive poem of some eighteen thousand verses. Gavlovič and his writings are presented in the context of other Franciscans of his time as well as of those active in the Pruské Franciscan house, not far from Trenčín, where Gavlovič wrote many of his works.

It is praiseworthy that Matica slovenská has sought to distinguish Gavlovič, none of whose writings have been published accurately or in their entirety — even some very small ones — in Slovakia at the present time. Certainly, it adds to his distinction by UNESCO, which incorporated the anniversary of Gavlovič's death into its 1987 calendar. The difficulty is that some of Eliáš' material is confusing and inaccurate or not as complete as it might have been.

Certain writings — *Adamova Promena* and *Katechyzmus*, for example — attributed traditionally to Gavlovič and so noted by Eliáš — are today no longer believed to have been written by Gavlovič. Just a half year after the publication of this *fotosúbor*, Gizela Slavkovská-Gáfriková published a listing of Gavlovič's writings and a rather detailed biography, more complete and accurate than that of Eliáš, in "Životopisné a bibliografické otázky Hugolína Gavloviča," *Slovenská literatúra*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 348-361. It is regrettable that these two specialists could not have collaborated on Gavlovič's biographical data. Then perhaps there would have been expressed at least some reservation about whether Gavlovič was a tutor for the Madočány children near the end of his life; that he was so is still claimed without any real

substantiation. Qualifications even in so popularly written a work as Eliáš' have a definite place.

In his citations from *Valaská Škola*, Eliáš, like every other modern Slovak editor including Slavkovská-Gáfriková, has a text with a *dlžeň*, something that Gavlovič *never* used in his writings, and in places that certainly do not correspond with modern Slovak usage. Since the autographs of all of Gavlovič's extant writings are preserved at Matica slovenská in Martin, Eliáš should have consulted these originals before producing the texts in the *fotosúbor*. Even Slavkovská-Gáfriková, in her June, 1987 publication *Hugolín Gavlovič Naučenia o Dobrych Mravoch*, does no better though she should certainly have been very familiar with the autographs of Gavlovič. Why modern Slovak editors like Eliáš and Slavkovská-Gáfriková persist in such reproduction of Gavlovič's writings is baffling. Indeed, photographs of various Gavlovič autographs included in the *fotosúbor* are clear evidence that Gavlovič did not use a *dlžeň*, and a *mākčeň* only irregularly with a "t" or "n." Whatever the nature of the intended audience, the original text accompanied by a modern rendition is preferable where so little of the autograph(s) is cited.

The cover of the *fotosúbor* is a striking watercolor by the outstanding contemporary painter Albín Brunovský, some of whose paintings and drawings have been on exhibit in various American locations during 1988. The photographs related directly to Gavlovič's life and writings are good and give the reader a reasonable acquaintance with so important a writer. Matica slovenská, and Dr. Eliáš, are to be commended for their efforts in producing this *fotosúbor* and, hopefully in the future, may correct some of its inadequacies.

Dejiny Slovenska, IV, (od konca 19. stor. do roku 1918) Pavel Hapák, et. al. Bratislava: Veda, 1986. 534 pp.

MICHAEL J. KOPANIC, JR.
University of Akron, Ohio

This is the fourth in the series entitled *Dejiny Slovenska*, which is the most recent multi-volume survey of Slovak history

to come out of the Slovak Socialist Republic. A group of leading Slovak scholars authored this book which is woven together fairly coherently for a collaborative effort. Volume IV outlines the major trends in Slovak politics, society, culture, and the economy from 1900 until the establishment of the Czecho-Slovak Republic in 1918. The authors also attempt to place Slovak history in the international setting of a Europe on the brink of revolutionary changes.

Some of the strongest sections in the book are the summaries of the macroeconomic and microeconomic development of pre-war industries, financial institutions, services, and agriculture in Slovakia. Useful tables and statistics are included. Likewise, the authors provide an analysis of each social class and the nationalities (except for the Carpathian Germans). In politics, the authors (especially J. Butvin) stress the disunity of the Slovak parties which prevented a common front to counter the strong Magyarization pressures that accelerated after the passage of the Apponyi Education Acts of 1907.

Despite the authors' noteworthy achievements, the volume is not without its shortcomings. In the bibliography there is an obvious neglect of post-World War II Western studies and émigré literature on Slovakia (for example, Hrušovský, Kirschbaum, Mikula, and others). Emigration to America, and elsewhere, could have been more carefully analyzed, especially its impact on political self-awareness in Slovakia. The wave of emigration, communications with friends and relatives, and the return of Slovaks from America to their homeland gradually raised the national and political consciousness of common folk throughout Slovakia and helped propel the movement to seek an alternative state in association with the Czechs.

As in many other studies from contemporary Czechoslovakia, there is a marked emphasis upon Slovak labor history and the influence of the working class both before and during World War I. The authors (especially Pavel Hapák) underline the rising significance of the Slovak Social Democratic Party, the trade unions, and the impact of such organizations as *spevokoly* (singing societies) in promoting Slovak national awareness and class consciousness. The authors aptly illustrate the nationality con-

flicts of Magyar chauvinism among Hungarian Social Democratic leaders. However, the reader must be wary of any tendency to overexaggerate the significance of the workers' movement. As Pavel Hapák points out (p. 258), no more than 6,346 Slovaks belonged to the Slovak Social Democratic organization in Hungary at its peak in 1907. More Slovaks were organizing in larger cities such as Budapest and Vienna, but we still lack detailed studies of these experiences.

These pre-war experiences reached a fruition in the latter stages of World War I and resulted in a surge of political and labor activism which is described in the 1917-18 period. As in many other Marxist histories, the authors ascribe too much influence to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 rather than to the March Russian Revolution which marked the beginning of the end for the old regimes of Europe.

Despite the concerns of the authors with the lower classes, they do not provide a good sense of what it was like to be a worker, a peasant, or a migratory laborer. Too often the authors stress social history more from an institutional and statistical angle, rather than presenting us with a close-up of what life was really like for the average person in Slovakia. Most obvious is the neglect of the Slovak people's association with their churches, the center of village life. What did Slovak people value most highly in their hierarchy of priorities, and how and why were these values changing? The authors do not tell us.

In a book which concentrates on a such narrow period, the authors could have presented a much better portrait of some of the leading personalities in Slovakia such as Pavel Blaho, Andrej Hlinka, or Emanuel Lehocký. Frequently, the reader obtains only a one-dimensional aspect of a person's life, usually his political or labor movement activities. A sense of what the total person was like is missing.

Although the book contains a good bibliography of published books and articles and a bibliographic essay, the authors did not footnote their work. Footnotes would have been a useful addition for students of modern Slovak history. The book also lacks maps and a subject index (only a name and place index are included) which should accompany a work of this nature.

Finally, the authors did not attempt to write any conclusions about the meaning of Slovak history in the period covered. Although such a task is always difficult in a collaborative work, this would have given the study more unity. If there is any common theme which pervades the study, it is the alliance of Magyar financial capital with a noble ruling class which was bent on Magyarizing and exploiting Slovak peasants and blue-collar workers.

These criticisms should not discourage one from obtaining the volume. The book is a valuable and useful reference tool for the library of any scholar of Slovak history. Many topics such as literature, labor, economic, and political history are well summarized in a readable style, and the interpretations are more objective than many earlier Marxist studies. This is surely the best available detailed survey of Slovakia in the early twentieth century.

Stephan Parak. *Die Schweiz und der Slowakische Staat*. Bern: Peter Lang (Europäische Hochschulschriften III/339), 1987, 308 pp.

STANISLAV J. KIRSCHBAUM
York University, Glendon College
Toronto, Canada

Once in a while, a pearl is dropped on the lap of scholars. All the necessary ingredients are there: a relatively unknown topic, thorough research, a scholarly approach, the proper use of references, balanced conclusions and a challenge to conventional wisdom. Such is Stephan Parak's study of the political and economic relations between two small states in wartime, Slovakia and Switzerland.

It is not necessary to belabour the point that the Slovak Republic does not generally enjoy a good reputation in Western scholarship. Created at a time when Germany was bent on redrawing the map of Central Europe, allied to it in war, involved in the persecution of the Jews and occupied in the end by one of the Allied powers, the Slovak state belonged to the camp of the van-

quished and suffered as a result the inevitable consequences of unconditional defeat. This outcome has guided many scholars who see more virtue in triumphalism than in the accurate reconstruction of the past.

Whatever may be the merits of the debate whether the Slovak Diet should have proclaimed Slovakia's independence on 14 March 1939, the fact is that on that day a new state appeared on the political map of Europe. Its leaders were determined to use the opportunity not only to safeguard the well-being of the nation, but also to ensure its growth and development. That there was great German pressure in Slovak political life, that the Slovak leaders took decisions contrary to the Christian philosophy of their party, that the Slovak economy fuelled the German war effort were all facts of the political life of this small state next to an expansionist ideological régime; equally true is the fact that this state sought to withstand and diminish some of these pressures and to lead the life of a small country which needs good relations with others to survive and thrive.

Parak's study looks at both of these themes in his examination of the relations between Slovakia and Switzerland. The first influenced the question of the diplomatic recognition of Slovakia. It was settled as much by the Swiss interpretation of international law as by Bern's appraisal of the power constellation in Europe in 1939. The Swiss "tacit recognition" of Slovakia reflected this as did the break of relations in 1945 and the recognition of the renewed state of Czechoslovakia. On the Slovak side, it was clearly most important to achieve the best diplomatic status possible, something which the Swiss were unwilling to grant, especially in wartime. Parak documents and analyzes this question not only thoroughly, but in an intelligent and balanced way.

The diplomatic tug-of-war between these two states did not prevent on the other hand important economic and cultural relations. A good part of this study concentrates on the scope and the benefits of these relations to both states. It makes all the more fascinating reading as these relations were being carried out while the rest of Europe was at war. The extent to which Slovakia could exist as an independent state is made quite clear by these relations.

The author also devotes an entire chapter on the role of

Switzerland in the fate of the Slovak Jews. His approach is factual and sensitive. He notes that in 1942, neither the Swiss government, nor the Red Cross lodged a protest against the deportations of Slovak Jews to Poland. Yet Swiss representatives in Slovakia were also very active in protecting Jews who were important for economic and commercial reasons and they intervened with Slovak authorities to see that presidential exceptions were granted to them.

After the 1944 revolt the situation was reversed. The meaning of the German Final Solution was then clear; the Swiss government and the Red Cross lodged protests against the deportations. But neither they nor the Slovak government could do anything — even protect those who had been granted presidential exceptions — as the Germans were now in control in Slovakia. Nevertheless many Swiss, including diplomatic representatives, with the support of the Slovak Red Cross and Church circles, were able personally to extend refuge to individual Jews. In the light of this record Parak asks whether the Swiss might have had more success if they had been more active on the official diplomatic level. He concludes: “One is left with the impression that on the Swiss side not all available opportunities were exhausted to save Slovak Jews in the Second World War” (p. 215).

In his overall conclusion Parak considers that the relations between these two states, like those of great powers, were determined by national interest as well as by their perception of the international situation. This is an interesting conclusion, not for Switzerland where to most it must seem self-evident, but for Slovakia where a perception still lingers among scholars that its policies and activities were dictated entirely by Berlin. Yet such a challenge to conventional wisdom is the normal outcome of this study. That is not the least of its merits.

This is a published doctoral dissertation as required by European universities (in this case the University of Basel) for the obtaining of the degree. Given its excellence, it should be translated into English; it needs very few modifications. Above all, it certainly deserves to be read by as wide a public as possible.

Carol Skalnik Leff. *National Conflict in Czechoslovakia: The Making and Remaking of a State, 1918-1987*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988. xi, 304 pp.

JAMES FELAK
Bloomington, Indiana

A persistent theme in the history of Czechoslovakia has been the Slovak quest for autonomy. In her book *National Conflict in Czechoslovakia: The Making and Remaking of a State, 1918-1917*, Carol Skalnik Leff examines this crucial issue from 1918 to the present. She deals above all with the Slovak question as manifested in the First Czechoslovak Republic and in the Communist state between 1948 and 1968, stressing similarities in how both the democratic and the Communist regimes handled the issue of autonomy.

In the interwar democracy as well as the postwar Communist state, Leff sees certain impediments to autonomy. In both states, Czechoslovakia's leaders believed that modernization, not autonomy, would solve the Slovak question. In the First Republic, Masaryk and other Czechoslovak leaders explained Slovak discontent as the product of Hungarian influence and believed that one only had to develop Slovakia culturally in order for the Slovaks to assimilate to a "Czechoslovak" nation. The Communist regime saw Slovakia's backwardness as a function of economics. It believed that economic modernization would solve the Slovak question by effecting a *zblíženie*, a drawing together of Czechs and Slovaks in a common culture. Both attempts failed. All they did was raise Slovak expectations and produce a more skilled and sophisticated nationalist leadership, better able to articulate Slovak discontent.

Another similarity between the two regimes, according to Leff, was the systemic obstacles they presented to autonomy. Although the First Republic's parliamentary system and relative freedom of expression gave the autonomist Slovak People's Party a public and parliamentary podium from which to advocate its autonomist program, the structure of the system guaranteed that autonomist concerns would not be addressed seriously by the

government. The system of proportional representation, reflected in the so-called *Pětka*, meant that the chances for the opposition to come to power were slim and that the government's main priority was those issues that could potentially affect the viability of the coalition. The government had little incentive to take up disruptive issues advocated only by parties outside the coalition. Although it officially recognized the Slovak nation, Communist Czechoslovakia likewise presented impediments for the Slovak autonomy movement. The liquidation of organized opposition and free expression, an ideological commitment to centralism, and bureaucratic rigidity all had a negative influence on the prospects for Slovak autonomy.

Leff ascribes persistent tensions between Czechs and Slovaks to an "ethos of mutual betrayal". Because Slovak nationalists had little hope for realizing autonomy under the interwar and post-1948 regimes, they sought to further their aims during times of crisis. Autonomist Slovaks took advantage of the periods when Prague, under fire from without, needed to consolidate its position at home. However, because the Slovaks got autonomy in the wake of the Munich agreement and federation in the wake of the Soviet invasion, many Czechs regarded the Slovaks as double-dealers willing to exploit the republic's troubles and do business with its external enemies for their own selfish ends. This, coupled with a perceived ingratitude on the part of the Slovaks, who seemed not to appreciate the Czech contributions to Slovakia's cultural and economic advancement, led Czechs to accuse Slovaks of betrayal. Many Slovaks, on the other hand, resented what they saw as a string of broken promises and a patronizing attitude toward them on the part of the Czechs.

Leff gives a mixed review of the post-1968 federalist Czechoslovakia. She claims it has not fully solved the Slovak question, which remains "deeply, and perhaps irreversibly, woven into the fabric of Czechoslovak politics as usual." One might ask whether Slovaks can ever enjoy autonomy in a system that gives the population no control over who its leaders are or what policies those leaders pursue.

There are two drawbacks with Leff's work that ought to be pointed out. First, although she correctly mentions that

geopolitical factors played a role in the Czech refusal to grant Slovakia autonomy, she fails to elaborate sufficiently on this important point. Secondly, her use of sociological jargon and attempt to test certain social science theories sometimes tends to obfuscate rather than illuminate the question at hand.

These shortcomings aside, Leff has presented a thoughtful analysis of a very complicated problem. Her work is balanced and insightful and she advances a number of valid arguments. Leff has confirmed the fact that it is possible to do worthwhile research on twentieth century Czechoslovakia without a visit to Czech and Slovak archives. Her book is recommended reading for those interested in the Slovak question and Czechoslovakia's history and politics in general.

Pavol Petruf. *USA a studená vojna (Politika amerického imperializmu v Európe 1945-1949)*. Bratislava: Pravda, 1985. 280 pp.

STANISLAV J. KIRSCHBAUM
York University, Glendon College
Toronto, Canada

One's first impression after reading this book is that the American school of historical revisionism has found a positive echo among Marxist scholars in Eastern Europe. This detailed study of American foreign policy in the immediate post-war years will, therefore, interest readers and students behind the Iron Curtain for whom access to Western scholarship is still restricted. It may also be seen as an indication of an attempt at openness in scholarship, certainly among Slovak Marxist academics, even though the first footnote is to a Soviet source (the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* no less), a practice that was *de rigueur* during the Stalinist years. However, the Western reader will find nothing new and certainly no original interpretation of the origins of the Cold War.

Unlike many revisionist historians, Petruf has not produced a study based primarily, if not uniquely, on documentary evidence. Rather, his sources are a mixture of published American

documents, Soviet and Czech volumes of documents, and Marxist and Western studies. A few American authors are favored and even quoted extensively. Unfortunately there are some liberties with the translations, which does not do credit to the book. But this is a minor problem which is attenuated by the detailed presentation of American foreign policy during the years 1944-1949.

Petruf's central thesis is that during the war governing circles in the United States had worked out a strategic plan that would enable the United States to control most of the planet in the post-war world. The United States would use economic, social and political means to establish this hegemony. Their only obstacle was the Soviet Union, which had come out of the war as a super-power and whose foreign policy was one that emphasized democracy and non-intervention in the internal affairs of a state. Accordingly, American foreign policy became bitterly anti-Soviet and anti-Communist. In the Cold War which ensued the aim of Washington was not only to contain the Soviet Union, but also to hold back the Moscow-led world revolutionary movement which had arisen after the war. The result, according to Petruf, was that "war — whether as a threat or reality — became firmly anchored in the minds of the people as an inevitable aspect of life in the 20th century. . . . [But] It did not prevent the growth of the strength and international authority of the Soviet Union, the appearance of a world socialist system and the development of the world revolutionary and national liberation movement" (pp. 269-270).

In six chapters the author unfolds his thesis by looking at American policy toward Central and Southeastern Europe; the shift from cooperation to confrontation between the USA and the USSR; the question of Germany; the Truman Doctrine and the policy of containment; the preparations, essence and goals of the Marshall plan; and the creation of NATO. The discussion in each chapter is thorough, even if presented with a certain slant. Among the main actors the author holds responsible for the Cold War are Truman, Kennan, Acheson, Byrnes, Forrestal and Churchill. According to Petruf, these men had moved away from Roosevelt's policy of cooperation with the USSR and, backed by American

right-wing circles, opted for a hard line policy toward the Soviet Union.

The book's main weakness, which disqualifies it as a work of serious scholarship, is not only the author's strident tone towards the United States, but also his adulatory approach to the Soviet Union. Not only is there no criticism of Soviet policy, but Kremlin decisions and actions which did more than just contribute to the unfolding of the Cold War are deliberately ignored. For example, in his discussion of the reasons for the reversal of Czechoslovakia's decision to partake in the discussions on the Marshall Plan, he does not mention that on 9 July 1947 a Czechoslovak delegation composed of Gottwald, Drtina and Masaryk was in Moscow where Stalin informed them that the Czechoslovak acceptance of the Marshall Plan would be considered as an action hostile to the USSR. Petruf writes: "When in the meantime it became clear that the Marshall Plan was essentially directed at the independence and sovereignty of the participating countries, Czechoslovakia revised its initial decision and withdrew its participation in the Paris discussions" (p. 229).

It is a pity that such a thorough study had to be spoiled because of ideological predilections. Marxist scholars will not convince anyone of the validity of their point of view as long as they continue to be unable to take a broader critical look at the events they examine.

June Granatir Alexander. *The Immigrant Church and Community: Pittsburgh's Slovak Catholics and Lutherans, 1880-1915*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987. xxxii, 198 pp.

M. MARK STOLARIK
The Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

In this revised Ph.D. dissertation, June Alexander set out "to bring to light the complex interplay of factors that led to the creation of ethnic parishes in American cities at the turn of the century" (p. xviii).

The essence of the book is that Roman Catholic Slovaks, while experiencing some local and internal problems while establishing their churches, had basically no quarrels with the local church hierarchy, whereas Lutheran Slovaks experienced major problems with their clerical leaders because the latter tried to impose a new orthodoxy upon their parishioners.

To prove her point Alexander focused upon the four Roman Catholic and one Lutheran parish founded by Slovak immigrants in Pittsburgh between 1895 and 1915. She gave a bit of the religious background of the immigrants, told how they established fraternals in the United States and how these, in turn, led in establishing the parishes, and then traced the actual story of each parish to 1915. Meanwhile, she also discussed the rise of lay initiative among Slovak immigrants, their regionalism and nationalism (or lack of it), and how these kept the various communities divided.

Alexander concluded that the story of Slovak immigration to Pittsburgh is one of coming together to form fraternals and parishes. While the immigrants achieved these goals they did so differently, with the Roman Catholics acting rather harmoniously while the Lutherans were rent by dogmatic divisions. The net result was that the five parishes became communities unto themselves, divided ultimately by regionalism, dialectical and religious differences.

While this is a competent study of the creation of five immigrant parishes over a twenty year period at the turn of the century, it has serious limitations. Alexander either did not realize (or chose to ignore) that when one studies ethnic parishes, one has to do so within the context of the local church body. For instance, when dealing with Pittsburgh Slovak Roman Catholics, she should have looked at their story within the *diocese* of Pittsburgh, which is the natural religious boundary of the area, not the borders of the city. Had she done so she might have noticed that two Slovak Roman Catholic parishes within the diocese (St. Anne's in Homestead, in 1909, and Sts. Cyril and Methodius in McKeesport, in 1922) seceded from the Roman Catholic Church and joined the independent Polish National Catholic Church. Since there were only a half dozen such secessions among Slovak

Roman Catholic parishes in the United States at the turn of the century, there had to be plenty of problems between the Roman Catholic Hierarchy and Slovak immigrants in the Pittsburgh diocese. That is why Alexander's characterization of Slovak Catholic immigrant relations with the local Hierarchy as being ones of "assertive deference" rings very false.

Furthermore, Alexander makes certain assertions about the Old World experience of Slovaks which rest upon shaky evidence. In denying lay involvement in parish affairs in Slovakia, or Old-World experiences of fraternalism, she relies too much on the contemporary observations of secular leaders, who were voicing uninformed opinions, or on the questionable memories of eleven informants, some of whom were born in America and others who must have been children when they immigrated here. How could such people possibly know anything about such complicated subjects as lay initiative or lodge creation in Slovakia? Indeed, there is to date no professional history of the various religions in Slovakia, nor has anyone covered the history of fraternal-benefit societies in Slovakia, which, contrary to Alexander's assertions, did exist there and can be traced back to 1460 A.D. Unfortunately, in today's Communist Slovakia those historians who are still allowed to practice their craft cannot write about the Churches (except in a pejorative way), nor can they focus on non-socialist movements. The only scholars who have touched upon these sensitive matters are Timothy L. Smith and his students and Alexander has chosen to either ignore their work, which was based upon solid research in Slovak archives, or she has chosen to disagree with their findings, without any substantial proof to refute them.

Thus, while Alexander's book provides us with a glimpse of Slovak parish and community life in turn-of-the-century Pittsburgh, it suffers from too narrow a perspective that ultimately distorts the larger picture of both Slovak and Slovak-American history.

Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka. Ján Kačala, Mária Pisarčíková et. al. Bratislava: Veda, 1987. 592 pp.

JOHN M. KOCHIK
Scottsdale, Arizona

This invaluable reference work is presented by SAV — the Slovak Academy of Sciences through its Ľudovít Štúr Linguistics Institute as the second in its series of Slovak language lexicons in a new single-volume. It is intended for the professional as well as for the average user as a source of information about the vocabulary of present-day Slovak, and as it evolved over the past forty years of its socialist development.

This single-volume is labeled “short (*krátky*)/concise (*stručný*)” in contrast with SAV’s earlier multi-volume dictionary. The first five-volume *Dictionary of the Slovak Language* (1959-68) has been sold out.

The core of the new *Slovník* is the more than 500 pages devoted to its A to Ž vocabulary numbering more than 50,000 entries. The information derives not only from the 5,000,000 citations available from the SAV Linguistics Institute’s card-catalog but also from others collected since the publication of the first academic *Slovník* and still more gleaned from belles lettres, special literature, publications, as well as the results of vast research in contemporary Slovak linguistics.

The preparatory material — those pages preceding the A to Ž vocabulary — contains two sections: The Basic Principles of Lexicography, and Abbreviations & Symbols. A noteworthy feature of the vocabulary section is the incorporation and domestication of loan-words in what is termed the process of “internationalization” (p. 11) of the language. To illustrate this flooding process, five words-in-a-row listed (p. 9) are: *džinsy* “jeans,” blue- , *džíp* “jeep,” *džiu-džicu* “jiu-kitsu,” *džob* “job,” *džokej* “jockey,” horse- . Among others are (here paginated): *bonsaj* “bonzai” miniature-tree /Japanese/ (51), *kibic* “kibitz,” in cards /Yiddish/ (152), *žardiniéra* “giardinierá” wide flower-pot /Italian/ (582).

Among the unexpectedly unexplainable omissions is: *ukrajinský* “Ukrainian,” whereas the following are listed in the text:

bieloruský "Belorussian" (47), *estonský* "Estonian" (98), *litovský* "Lithuanian" (184), *lotyšský* "Latvian" (185), *polabský* "Polabian" (306).

The *Slovník* is the product of a collaborative effort by SAV's experts mentioned opposite the main title-page. Those who assiduously prepared this long-awaited lexicon can be proud of their achievements.

The *Slovník* is an invaluable, readable, handy reference work of contemporary Slovak language. Another, the second, step forward in Slovak lexicography. Apart from its precious contents, the book's binding is disappointingly fragile and brittle!

Ludvík Patera. *Alexander Matuška*. Praha: Melantrich, 1985, 440 pp.

LOUISE B. HAMMER
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The Slovak literary critic Alexander Matuška (1910-1975) is known to American students of Czech and Slovak literature for his essay on Karel Čapek, *Človek proti skaze* (1963), which was published in English as *Man Against Destruction* (1981), and for his book *J.C. Hronský* (1970) published in Bratislava. Matuška's participation in Slovak intellectual and literary life began in the nineteen thirties and continued throughout his life. His *Vybrané spisy* (1972-1978) were published in four volumes in Bratislava. As one of the leading literary critics in Czechoslovakia, Matuška had an abiding interest in both Slovak and Czech literature, and was cognizant of the connection between national literatures and world literature.

The knowledgeable Czech Slovakist Ludvík Patera, who teaches Slovak literature at Charles University, has written the first monograph on Matuška. Patera's treatise appears as the seventy-sixth volume in the series *Odkazu pokrokových osobností naší minulosti*. The book consists of two main parts: the first (265 pages) contains Patera's well documented and reliable presenta-

tion of the chronological development of Matuška's life and work; the second presents a selection of Matuška's writings, which have been translated into Czech. Separating these two parts are thirty-two pages of photographs, which include facsimiles of Matuška's published work, manuscripts and letters.

The totality of Matuška's activity emerges through Patera's method of combining biographical and literary data. Interspersed among the excerpts from Matuška's critical works are quotes from interviews with him that were published in *Slovenské pohľady* in the seventies. Patera skillfully weaves these quotations into his text, and allows the reader to learn of the life experiences that influenced Matuška's development as a human being and as a literary critic.

Patera's research on Matuška's student years in Prague increases our understanding of the societal forces that had a great impact on young intellectuals during the inter-war period. While enrolled at Charles University, Matuška was associated with the group R10 (along with Ján Kostra, Dobroslav Chrobák, Michal Chorváth and others). This group was known as "The Young Davists," the name stemming from their journal *Dav*, to which they actively contributed. During his student days, Matuška was greatly influenced by the ideas of the Czech critic and artist, F.X. Šalda. They found common ground on various points. Neither supported the official view of that time, which claimed the existence of a Czechoslovak language with two versions, the Czech version and the Slovak version (pp. 27-28). They agreed that merging the two languages would only weaken and impoverish them both. As various scholars have pointed out, Slovak was at a disadvantage in the linguistic relationship between Czech and Slovak during the inter-war period, since efforts to bring the two languages together habitually led in the direction of Czech, to the detriment of Slovak.

The author's enthusiasm for his subject is evident throughout this well written and richly documented book. It is a welcome contribution to the field of literary history and criticism. In addition, Patera's book contains useful bibliographic information on Matuška's work, corrections of errors that appeared in some earlier editions, and an index of names at the end.

Il'ja Čičvák. *Vyvolávanie slnka*. Ottawa, Canada: Spoločnosť priateľov slovenskej literatúry, 1984.

YVONNE GRABOWSKI
York University
Toronto, Canada

This is a very attractively-presented volume. The motto of the book, taken from Plato, illustrates the author's conviction that people strive for ideals which are most often unattainable. The same idea is expressed in the title of the novel — *The Summoning of the Sun* — and reinforced by an excellent illustration on the title page by Miro Malis, representing a modern day Sisyphus pushing the sun up the mountain.

This Platonic view of the world is fundamentally opposed to the Marxist concept of the universe. It is most probably this difference of perception that accounts for the fact that Čičvák now lives and writes in Canada and not in Czechoslovakia. The novel tells us of the attempts made by individuals, and especially the main character James, to evoke the sun, to find a modicum of happiness in a totalitarian, cruel society. And it is a sad comment on this society that when the sun finally appears at the end of the novel, James cannot enjoy the magnificent view because he has died from the effects of a bullet he received during a peaceful political demonstration.

However, in Čičvák's novel, life's frustrations are not limited to James. Every character that appears in the book has been affected one way or another, thwarted in his aspirations, mocked in his most sacred beliefs, slandered, unjustly imprisoned or exploited. Only utter opportunists seem to be able to survive somehow in this climate. Čičvák portrays human lives that are spent looking for peace and happiness, unable to successfully accomplish this quest. Fate, circumstances, or other people always intervene to warp human hopes and expectations. Older people know this truth, but the young approach life with great intensity and a naive trust which gets cruelly deceived in the end.

Čičvák's novel is more than a story about the suffering of people in Czechoslovakia under Communist rule. It is also a sad

parable about life's unfulfilled dreams and shattered hopes. In the end it does not matter that the unnamed "štátnik" in the novel has been deprived of his lucrative position — the system that produced him will stay on and life will continue essentially as before. This conclusion finds its reinforcement in the previous events of the novel where the injustices that have been committed against the generation of the parents are repeated in the generation of their sons and daughters.

Several recurring motifs in the novel reinforce the unity and central idea of the plot. The main one is, of course, the motif of the sun — a potent symbol — which appears only too rarely throughout the story. Time also plays an important part in the book. All through the novel we became intensely aware of its passing, and the passing of history. Loneliness is another strong theme. People closest to the characters are rarely near when needed. Those that are around are incapable of relating totally.

This is a sad book, but a very well-written one. It skillfully unites the plot and the imagery to imbue us with the sense of shattered young dreams and impending death.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES RECEIVED

(a) From Eastern Europe

- Anger, Ján, "Některé vojensko-politické aspekty obrany Československa v druhé polovině 30. let," *Historický časopis*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Avenarius, Alexander, "Stepné národy v Európe: charakter a vývoj avarskej spoločnosti," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 2, 1988).
- Baranovský, Michal, *et. al.*, *Dejiny Slovenska, VI (1945- 1960)*, Bratislava: Veda, 1988.
- Bartlová, Alena, "Integračný proces československej ekonomiky v medzivojnovom období," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Bobák, Ján, "Maďarská otázka v Československu v rokoch 1945-1948," *Slezský sborník*, 85 (No. 1, 1987).
- Cambel, Samuel, "The Movement for the General Agrarian Reform in Slovakia in the Year 1945," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, 15 (1986).
- Čičaj, Viliam ed., *Trnavská univerzita v slovenských dejinách* (Bratislava: Veda, 1987).
- Čierna-Lantayová, Dagmar, "Československo-maďarská smluva z apríla 1949 v spojeneckom systéme socialistických krajín," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 4, 1987).
- Faltus, Jozef, "Development of Capitalist Industrialization of Slovakia and Its Problems," *SHS*, 15 (1986).
- Chovanec, Jaroslav, "Vznik a formovanie ľudovodemokratického a socialistického politického systému v Československu," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 1, 1988).
- Deák, Ladislav, "Autonómia Slovenska v plánoch horthyovského Maďarska v roku 1938," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Eliáš, Michal & Vojtech Šarluška compiled by, *Národná svetlica: výber dokumentov k dejinám Matice slovenskej* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Fano, Štefan, "Československo-sovietske vzťahy v rokoch 1945-1948," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 1, 1988).
- Halaga, Ondrej R., "Pakty vzájomnosti obchodných stredísk Krakova a Košíc," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 2, 1988).
- Hapák, Pavel, "Fragen zur wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der Slowakei am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts," *SHS.*, 15 (1986).
- Haviar, Štefan & Ivan Kučma, *V pamäti národa. Kniha o Matici slovenskej* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Holotíková, Zdenka, "Komunistická strana Československa a československá štátnosť," *Hč.* 36 (no. 3, 1988).
- Hubenák, Ladislav, "KSČ a parlamentné voľby v októbri 1929," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 4, 1987).
- Hrnko, Anton, *Politický vývin, a protifašistický odboj na Slovensku (1939-1941)*, Bratislava: Veda, 1988.
- Huttová, Mária "Príspevok k dejinám Právnickej akadémie v Bratislave v rokoch

- 1850-1874," *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea, História* 28, LXXXI (1988).
- Kaľavský, Michal, "Zrušenie cechov a problémy spoločensko-ekonomickej aktivizácie remeselníkov na Slovensku," *Ibid.*
- Karkuš, Ondrej, comp., *Dvadsať rokov práce s krajanmi (k 20. výročiu vzniku OZS MS)*, Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988.
- Kazimír, Štefan, "Der Fernhandel der Städte in der Slowakei im 16. Jahrhundert," *SHS*, 15 (1986).
- Kollár, Ján, "Riešenie problému zásobovania a výživy na Slovensku v r. 1948," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 2, 1988).
- Kopčan, Vojtech, "The Last Stage of the Ottoman Rule in Slovakia," *SHS*, 15 (1986).
- Kormúth, Dezider, *Bibliografia článkov zo slovenských novín a časopisov, 1918-1945, Odbor 7. Obchod. Zv. 1. Hospodárstvo na Slovensku, 1918-1928* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1986).
- Kováč, Dušan, "Myšlienka československej štátnosti. Jej vznik a realizácia," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Krajčovičová, Natália, "Triedne a sociálne zápasy na Slovensku v dvadsiatych rokoch nášho storočia," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 4, 1987).
- Macko, Pavel, "Podiel sociálnej demokracie na utváraní politického systému Československa v rokoch 1918-1929," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Marsina, Richard, "La Lutte pour la liturgie slave dans la Grande Moravie (L'hommage au 1100 anniversaire de la mort d'archevêque Method)," *SHS*, 15 (1986).
- Matula, Vladimír, et. al., *Dejiny Slovenska, II (1526-1848)*, Bratislava: Veda, 1987.
- Ondrejka, Kliment, ed., *Ja som dobrý remeselník: výber remeselníckeho folklóru* (Bratislava: Mladé leta, 1987).
- Oslanský, František, "Vyznam cirkevných desiatkov v stredoveku na Slovensku," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 6, 1987).
- Petách, Emil, *Dejiny mincovania v Košiciach* (Košice: Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1986).
- Pet'kovský, Ondrej, *200 Rokov Slovenského Evanjelického A. V. cirkevného zboru v Aradáči, 1786-1986* (Aradáč: SEAVCZ, 1986).
- Pisoň, Štefan, "Vznik Československej republiky a kultúra na Slovensku," *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea, Historia* 28, LXXXI (1988).
- Ratkoš, Peter, "Vzt'ahy naddunajských Slovanov a starých Maďarov v rokoch 881-1018," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 6, 1987).
- Skladany, Marián, "Der Anteil des slowakischen Kupferwesens an der Verwollkommnung der Technologie der Verhüttung von Kupfer im 15. Jahrhundert," *SHS*, 15 (1986).
- Sládek, Zdeňek, "K otázce financování slovenských buržoazních politických stran za první republiky," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 3, 1988).
- Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990), II (E-J)*, Martin: Matica slovenská, 1987.

- Sopko, Július & Július Valach eds., *Nitrianský kódex (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1987).*
- _____, "O školstve a vzdelanosti na Slovensku v stredoveku," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 2, 1988).
- Stanislav, Ivan, *Život v slove. Rozprávanie profesorovi Jánovi Stanislavovi (Banská Bystrica: SNP, 1987).*
- Šutaj, Štefan, "Vznik Strany slobody a formovanie jej programu v prvých rokoch po oslobodenie," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 1, 1988).
- Tomek, František, *Z dejín revolučného odborového hnutia na Slovensku v rokoch 1944-1948 (Bratislava: Práca, 1986).*
- Varsik, Branislav, "Slovenské osídlenie v Gemeri a pôvod názvu rieky Blh," *Hč.*, 35 (No. 4, 1987).
- Zuberec, Vladimír, "Prvý slovenský robotnícky kalendár," *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea. Historia* 28, LXXXI (1988).

(b) From the West

- Dawisha, Karen, *Eastern Europe, Gorbachev and Reform: The Great Challenge (New York: Cambridge U. Press, 1988).*
- Đurica, Milan Š., "The Historical Origins and Nature of Slovak Nationalism," *Slovak Studies* XXIV (1984).
- _____, "Das historische Vermächtnis Dr. Jozef Tisos," *Slowakei*, XXIV (1986).
- Gavlovič, Hugolín, *Valaska škola*, ed. by Gerald J. Sabo. Introduction by Lubomír Ďurovič (Columbus: Slavica, 1988).
- Grébert, Arvéd, "Die Erklärung der slowakischen Selbständigkeit am 14. März 1939," *Slowakei*, XXIV (1986).
- Kirschbaum, Jozef M., "Die Australien-Slowaken und die idee der slowakischen Selbständigkeit," *Ibid.*
- Leff, Carol Skalnik, *National Conflict in Czechoslovakia: The Making and Remaking of the State, 1918-1987 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).*
- Magocsi, Paul Robert, "Religious Identity in the Carpathians," *Cross Currents*, 7 (1988).
- Mikuš, Jozef A., "Zwei Historiker: Ján Mlynárik versus Viliam Plevza," *Slowakei*, XXIV (1986).
- Parak, Stephan, *Die Schweiz und der Slowakische Staat 1939-1945 (Bern: Peter Lang, 1987).*
- Rajnoch, Karl, "Das kulturelle Leben in der Slowakei nach der Reformation," *Slovak Studies*, XXIII (1983).
- Rebichini, Andrea, "I Greco-Catholici della Slovachia Orientale: storia e attualità," *Ibid.*
- Stolarik, M. Mark, "From Field to Factory: The Historiography of Slovak Immigration to the U.S. and Canada (1976-1987)," *Ethnic Forum*, 8 (No. 1, 1988).
- Vavrovič, Jozef, "Exercitia Joannes Palarik," *Slovak Studies*, XXIII (1983).

- Vnuk, František, *Mat' svoj štát znamená život: Politická biografia Alexander Macha* (Cleveland: Slovak Institute, 1987).
- Vondracek, Thomas J., *Commentary on the Czechoslovak Civil Code* (Hingham, MA: Kulver Academic Publishers, 1988).
- Walters, E. Garrison, *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945* (Syracuse University Press, 1988).
- Wilson, Paul, "Religious Movement in Czechoslovakia," *Cross Currents*, 7 (1988).

CONTRIBUTORS

JOSEF KALVODA, Ph.D. (Columbia), is Professor of History and Political Science at Saint Joseph College, West Hartford, Connecticut. Author of many books and articles on Czechoslovakia, East Central Europe, and the Soviet Union, he recently published *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia* (1986).

PATRICIA A. KRAFCIK, Ph.D., (Columbia), currently teaches Russian language, literature, and folklore at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. She is preparing other articles and a book on Jánošík and the Carpathian brigand tradition, as well as an anthology of Slovak folk ballads.

RAYMOND J. KUPKE, M.A., Cand. Phil. (Catholic University), is a Roman Catholic priest and Archivist of the Diocese of Paterson. From 1979 to 1981 he was Vice Chancellor and Secretary to the Bishop of Paterson. He is the author of *Living Stones: A History of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Paterson* (1987).

M. MARK STOLARIK, Ph.D. (Minnesota) is President of the Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies in Philadelphia. Author or editor of seven books and over thirty articles on American Slovaks, immigration, and ethnicity, he is editor of the *Immigration History Newsletter* and the annual *Slovakia*. He recently edited *Forgotten Doors: The Other Ports of Entry to the United States* (1988).

GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts of articles for publication should be sent to the editor. Articles should normally not exceed twenty-five pages in length, and should be submitted in triplicate, typed double-spaced, with generous margins for copyediting. Footnotes should also be double-spaced, numbered, and placed at the end of the paper. Text and format should adhere to the style outlined in Kate Turabian's *A Manual for Writers*. Proper orthography and diacritical marks must be supplied for all foreign words. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage is provided.

Books for review are to be sent to the editor. Unsolicited book reviews are not encouraged.

Individuals who wish to review books should request them from the editor. They should send a 'curriculum vitae' with their request.

HAMMER 1999.21

THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Organized in 1907

EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK, K.S.G., Honorary President

DANIEL F. TANZONE
President

JOHN A. HOLY
Secretary-Treasurer

JOSEPH J. TALAFIOUS, Esq.
Vice-President

ANNE Z. SAROSY
Vice-President

PHILIP R. TUHY
Vice-President

Executive Committee

Daniel F. Tanzone, Edward J. Behuncik, John A. Holy, Anna S. Granchay
Joseph R. Kristofik, Steve J. Hruska, Cecilia Sarocky, Andrew F. Hudak, Jr.,
Joseph Stefka, Stephen J. Kavulich, Justine Wesnak,
Edward A. Zelenak, George N. Kantor, John Hvasta

Anna M. Vizza, President, Ladies Auxiliary

Auditors

Joseph Valencik

Mary Jacko

Patrick Zelenak

SLOVAK FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK LADIES ASSOCIATION
Cleveland, Ohio

FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK UNION OF THE U.S. AND CANADA
Cleveland, Ohio

SLOVAK CATHOLIC SOKOL
Passaic, N.J.

NATIONAL SLOVAK SOCIETY OF THE U.S.A.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

LADIES PENNSYLVANIA SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

FIRST SLOVAK WREATH OF THE FREE EAGLE
Bridgeport, Conn.

SLOVAK NEWSPAPERMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Joseph C. Krajsa, K.S.G., President

THE SLOVAK GARDEN, INC.
Andrew F. Hudak, Jr., President
Winter Park, Florida

SLOVAKIA

\$6.00 per issue

Printed By

JEDNOTA PRESS

A Division of Jednota Communications, Inc.
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057
U.S.A.